

THE CALCUTTA JOURNAL,

OF

Politics and General Literature.

VOL. V.]

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1832.

[No. 215]

MISCELLANEOUS.

—81—

English Papers.

Following of Precedents.—It was observed by an acute Italian writer, that if we inquire into the causes of the mischief which takes place in the world, we shall almost always find that the chief, both in the case of nations and individuals, is the following of precedents. A certain practice, for instance, was adopted in the infancy of a nation; and it is retained in its old age, when circumstances render it no longer suitable. The old man, in like manner, continues the practices which he followed with impunity in his youth, forgetting that he is no longer possessed of the same organic vigour.

There is not an abuse for which the sanction of great names cannot be adduced. Authority is always at hand to supply prejudice with abundance of resources. When the superstitious peasant of Lower Canada is tempted to adopt some of the practices of the enterprising New Englanders, he is told by the Priest to do as his father did, who lived very well without these practices. The daughter of Mr. Loveday, we see, pronounces with emphasis the religion of Edward and Alfred the Great. When the first Christian Missionaries appeared in the island, they too were met with the words religion of our ancestors. Our Courts of Law in like manner ring with the names of Chief Justice Hale, Chief Justice Holt, and other grave and venerable authorities, the pronouncing of which is alone deemed sufficient to exclude the influence of all reason and all inquiry.

The practices of the Whigs at any time, from 1688 downwards, form, in particular, the subject of many an appeal. Thus we see "a Whig Lawyer" is taunted by a Ministerial Morning Paper with his want of respect for the precedents set him by the Whig Societies for the prosecution of libels, formed immediately after the Revolution of 1688. But does it follow that every "practice of a Whig King, a Whig Parliament, Whig Nobleman and Gentlemen, and Whig Jurors," must be followed for all time coming? England owes much to the Whigs and the Revolution of 1688; but the most valuable part of what it owes to them is, without doubt, the freedom of inquiry of which, directly or indirectly, they were the authors, and which opened a wide door for improvement of every kind to succeeding generations. If we know more respecting many essential points than the Whigs of 1688, that does not either diminish their merit, or the debt which we owe to them. The world has not been idle since 1688; many important discoveries have been made in the interim; the road to true science had then just been opened, as was observed by Leibnitz, the second, if not the first man of that age, and we have had the benefit of much and varied experience of a most important description. It can be no reproach to the great men of 1688, that we know more than they did; but it would be a cutting reproach to us, if it could be shewn, that they knew as much as we yet do.

The character of the population of England has undergone a great change (we think, decidedly for the better), during the last 20 years. What then must be the change, operated during the last 135? England at the Revolution was in a great measure without that numerous and wealthy middle class with which its towns are now filled, the authors of most of that to which we owe what raises us above other nations, and the depositaries of the most valuable knowledge; and its lower classes were coarse in man-

ners, and sunk in ignorance, while, go where we will, we find in the present day common mechanics possessed of knowledge and cultivated understandings. From this class, Rennies, Arkwrights, Watts, and Telfers are perpetually starting forth. Institutions like the Anderson Institution of Glasgow and the one lately set on foot in Edinburgh for the diffusion of science among the lower classes will add rapidly to the mass of intelligence. The practices of the men of 1688 had reference to a very different description of people, and a deviation from these practices can no more be a reproach to a Whig in the present day, than it can be a reproach to a Calvinist that he does not insist on burning Socinians—to a Scots Presbyterian, that he does not, like John Knox, insist on the cutting off Catholic Idolators—or to the Lutheran, that he does not, like Luther, persecute the Anabaptists without mercy. We are not to revert to Star-chamber practice, because it was the subject of the eulogy of Bacon, nor to seek out and burn witches, because the great Lord Chief Justice Hale approved of such a course. Let us decide according to the means of knowledge which we ourselves possess, and not according to the means which our fathers possessed, availing ourselves of the truths which they handed down to us, without adopting their tests for the discovery of truth, of cutting off ears, or burning alive, which experience has proved to be very ill adapted to the end in view. *Morning Chronicle, April 16.*

Pawnbroking Project.—Notwithstanding the pawnbroking project has the air of a newly-started proposal, it is any thing but new. It was probably digested and carried into practice, as far as it could be, several months ago, and an arrangement made as to who should receive the public money. It was known to us at the time that a survey had been made on both sides of the river Thames, from above London-bridge downwards, of all the warehouses which might be used to the store of corn, and soon afterwards the craft in the river were constantly filled with wheat. An immense stack of warehouses were run up at Rotherhithe, the contractor undertaking to have them ready to receive wheat in six weeks from the laying of the first brick; and offers were made to rent other immense warehouses, if the persons to whom the offer was made would build them. The pawnbroking project is thus no new project; no doubt it will be found that the corn has been already warehoused, and the friends of Ministers ready to receive the money for it. Nine-tenths of the million will probably go at once into the pockets of the land owners; the other tenth might be lent to indifferent persons, or to such as might appear to be indifferent persons, to save appearances, and to give the semblance of fairness to the whole. We will suppose a case:—A certain northern Nobleman sends several Members to the House of Commons—he has large estates, from which at present he receives but little rent, his tenants have damaged corn for which no market can be obtained. What can be more easy or more convenient than a nominal sale of the corn to an agent, who having deposited it in warehouses, pawns it to the Government, and hands the money over to the farmers, who pay their rent with it; or it may be, pays the money over to the Noble Lord, who had taken his rent in kind from the tenants. What would this be but putting the million into the pockets of the Land Owners; in other words, the voting the people's money out of their pockets into their own? But then there is the corn, at any rate? Yes, there is the corn, sure enough; but here is another objection which the Committee have not noticed. The corn

is to be pawned for two-thirds its value: if it be not redeemed, and the interest paid in twelve months, or eighteen months, it is forfeited, and then it becomes the property of the pawnbroker, who is to sell it, or burn it, or waste it in some way. Not more, however, than two-thirds the value is to be lent on it: but how is the value to be ascertained? By "officers appointed by the Government." Well, but these officers must be recommended to the Government, and by whom? Why, by the Noble Lord, to be sure, or, what amounts to the same thing, through his agency. Thus the job is complete. None but damaged corn will be stored, corn which, if kept by the farmer, must be suffered to rot, or be used to feed animals. Will it not rot then in the pawnbroker's warehouses?—Will it not be the interest of the Land-owners that it should rot? If, instead of feeding animals, it be suffered to rot, will not the price of pork, and poultry, and eggs rise? Will any body believe that the full value of the corn will not be obtained from the Government in the first instance? Is there any the least security that no more than the full value will be obtained? Can any body be so besotted as to imagine, that those who have so advantageously pawned the corn will pay the expenses of turning it every ten days and occasionally of sifting it—that they will pay warehouse rent, and interest of money—and, after all, take back the corn, diminished as it would be in quantity, under even the most careful management? No one will expect any thing of the kind. The corn, once pawned, will be wasted, and the money advanced will be taken from the people and given to the Land Owners.—*British Luminary.*

Roman Catholic.—We insert a letter from a Roman Catholic, in Reply to our remarks of yesterday on the subject of the Irish White Boy oath. The copy of the Decalogue, which he sends us, jumbles, as we suspected, the first and second commandment into one; and then, in order to complete the number, the last commandment, having reference solely to inordinate desire, is absurdly rent asunder. All this we knew before. It will be observed our correspondent pleads for liberality: so he had need! or, at least, so had his faith. He says, that bowing to an image (or a painting of course) is only expressive of our veneration for the original. The originals of the greater part of the Santa Marias were the mistresses of the painters, or of those of their patrons. We thought of inserting the prayer to the Virgin Mary, mentioned in the letter, but feel a delicacy on account of its profaneness. We need only observe, that he calls it a prayer to the Virgin Mary. And though the object of that prayer be only to pray to the Virgin, to pray to God for him the supplicant (who, by the way, is directed to pray to God for himself), how can he be sure that the Virgin hears him? Nay, how is it possible that the Virgin should hear all the Roman Catholics who pray to her in all parts of the globe, except after her decease she became ubiquitous—that is, became God himself? And does it not follow from hence, that the only being fit to be addressed in prayer, is one every where present, and cognizant of every thing that takes place; so that he must, by his nature, both hear the prayers and know the sincerity of heart from which they spring, none of which qualities can appertain to a dead woman, however pious her life may have been whilst living. This absurdity of addressing in a prayer a personage that cannot possibly hear all the supplicants, and may hear none of them, has so affected some of the Roman Catholics, that we have actually seen in their Rituals a prayer to this effect:—"O God, pray the Virgin to pray thee for us." We entreat our readers not to suppose that we are treating such a subject with levity; we treat of it with sorrow, and in sober sadness. We are very glad to see religion brought to the standard of reason, our primary rule; and therefore have no objection to the Catholic's illustration of his argument by the anecdote of Lord Amherst: but a little consideration will show him that it is inapplicable. Was the picture of our Sovereign made to be bowed down to? Did Lord Amherst himself bow down to it? Do the Catholics mean to say that their bowing down to images is a mere gratuitous act of respect to the supposed originals, which may be omitted or performed at pleasure? Oh, no: the bowing down to images makes a part of their "word of God," that is, the word of their "Infallible Councils!"—*Times.*

Feline Curiosity.—A cat, belonging to George Boxall, of this town (long known as the Ditchling postman) has a kitten to which Nature, we suppose in a frolicsome mood, has given five perfect legs, two before as in common, and three behind, the supernumerary one being placed between the other two; and what renders it further noticeable is the peculiarity of its foot, which possesses all the members common to two feet, but so closely connected, that when in motion, they have the appearance of but one. This extraordinary kitten is of a dark tortoiseshell colour, and being strong and lively, no doubt is entertained of saving it for the inspection of those who may be fond of seeing natural curiosities.—*Sussex Advertiser.*

Quarterly Review.—The following account of this journal appears in BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE of the present month. There is a quarrel between the proprietors (we believe) of the two journals; and, as the case is when people of a certain character quarrel, the world is benefitted by a little display of truth:—

What is the opinion of the QUARTERLY REVIEW upon any given subject? It is possible that it may be the opinion of nobody; at the very best, it is the opinion of Mr. Southey, or of Mr. another person, (who must be pleased), Gifford himself. Now, I have much respect for the talents of each of these two gentlemen, but from which of them is it that either I or any sensible man would care much to hear an opinion upon two thirds of the matters that do, or should fall to be discussed in a journal of the general literature of England? Suppose, for a moment, such a book as Pope's DUNCIAD were to be published to-morrow, Mr. Southey, even though he did not find himself mentioned in it, would infallibly toss up his nose and pronounce it the work of a man of no imagination—no originality—no poetry. Mr. Gifford would not in his heart like it, because he would feel, after reading two full pages, that all was over with his BAYARD and MEXIAD. How would this work be reviewed in the QUARTERLY? It would not be reviewed by any hearty fellow, because he would know that he could not express his true opinion of it without offending Southey and Gifford in the first place, and without saying things that could not fail to appear quite absurd, and out of place in the QUARTERLY REVIEW, in the second. How could a sharp witty satirist be praised with any honesty or effect in a journal, the prime supporter of which is the author of THE VISION OF JUDGEMENT—in a journal where you find Milton extolled as a first-rate poet in the one number, and Shelley run down as no poet at all in the next—in a journal where you find WAVERLEY and GUY MANNERING treated as works of very slender merit (the second of them indeed as little better than a piece of silliness), and IVANHOE lauded to the third Heavens—in a journal where William Hazlitt is talked of as a mere prattling ninny, and Signor Ugo Fudgiolo as one of the greatest geniuses in Europe? It would not be reviewed by Mr. Gifford, because Mr. Gifford, though not at all delighted with the book, could not for his life be blind to its merits; and although he might also have many private reasons for not wishing to speak the truth, I do the splenetic Mr. Gifford the justice to say, that I do not believe he is capable of sitting down gravely to write in his own person what he feels to be untrue. Mr. Southey would receive the book at Keswick by his next mail-coach parcel, and I think he might very possibly set about reviewing it. But then he would speak such utter nonsense about it, that Mr. Gifford would not hear of its being inserted. They would laugh over it for a day or two, particularly if it were written in hexametres, or contained any bulletin of the state of Mr. Southey's family; and then the article would either be put in the fire, or enclosed under a blank cover to "the British," in the view of helping my poor grandmother's pot to boil for a day or two longer, or perhaps of extinguishing the old body's life altogether in the smoke."—*Times, April 5.*

County of Sussex.—To the credit and honour of the county of Sussex, it knows very little of the prosecuting Association of Bridge-Street. We do not know that it has subscribed 10*l.* towards its support; and we are not aware that more than one individual in this town contributed towards its funds, and who certainly will never again subscribe. We are happy to bear this testimony of the correct feelings of our townsmen.—*Brigh. Chron.*

Duke of Somerset.—Anecdotes of that absurd person the proud Duke of Somerset, who lived in the reigns of Anne and George I.:—On a quarrel with George I. the Duke threw up his appointment of Master of the Horse in a manner which sufficiently evinces the littleness of pride. Having commanded his servants to strip off the royal and put on the family livery, he sent for a common dust-cart, and directed that all the badges of his office should be thrown into it; he then, followed by his retinue and the aforesaid vehicle, proceeded to the court-yard of St. James's palace, and, after ordering the driver to *shoot the rubbish*, he stalked back indignantly to Northumberland-house, accompanied by the same cavalcade in which he had left it. This petty and petulant spitefulness would have accorded far better with the spirit of some retail demagogue of the city, than a nobleman, the lustre of whose aristocratical honours depended solely upon the preservation of the majesty of that throne which he degraded himself by insulting. That his pride had little accordance with English humour, we need not be told. "Get out of the way," said one of his people to a countryman who was driving a hog along the path by which the Duke had to pass. "Why?" inquired to boot. "Because my Lord Duke is coming, and he does not like to be looked at," rejoined the man. The clown, enraged at the imperious manner in which the mandate was urged, exclaimed, "But I will see him, and my pig shall see him too;" and seizing the animal by the ears, held it up before him till his Grace and retinue were gone by. Lady Charlotte Finch, his second wife, once tapped him playfully on the shoulder with her fan; he turned to her with marked displeasure, and observed, "My first wife, Madam never took that liberty, and she was a Percy." His two youngest daughters were accustomed to watch him, standing while he slept in the afternoon; one of them, overcome with fatigue, sat down; the Duke awoke unexpectedly—he assured her that he should remember her disobedience, and accordingly left her 20,000*l.* less than her sister.—*Times*, April 5.

Lamentable Suicide of Lieut. Charles Trail.—At three o'clock yesterday (April 2,) an inquisition was taken before Thomas Shelton, Esq., in the committee-room of Bethlem Hospital, on the body of Lieutenant Charles Trail, aged 30 years, a patient in the above asylum, who destroyed himself in the following manner:—

Charles Beech, one of the keepers belonging to the institution, deposed, that on Sunday last, about twelve o'clock at noon, he locked the deceased in his cell in the gallery, having previously shaved and dressed him. He was in such a weak and debilitated state, that he had not sufficient strength to dress himself. After witness had locked him up, he went into the Green-yard to attend the other patients, but shortly returned to him, and then he was sitting on the side of his bed. Witness endeavoured to persuade him to take his ration of food, but he refused, as he had done for several days previous. Witness again left him, and in about half an hour after he returned again, and on unlocking his cell-door he found the deceased close against it, with his face towards him, as if he was coming out. Witness did not immediately on opening the door know that he had destroyed himself, but afterwards found that he was suspended to his white neckkerchief by the neck, the end of which was very ingeniously made fast to a single wire of a slight fence over the door of his cell, enclosing the iron grating. He was quite dead, though warm; a wooden bowl which the deceased had for a certain use, was near him, and on which he stood to fasten the end of the neckkerchief to the fence. Witness instantly procured Mr. Wright, the medical gentleman, who bled the deceased, but life was quite extinct.

Mr. Edward Wright, the medical gentleman, and superintendent of the establishment, stated that on his seeing the deceased he was quite dead: he opened a vein, but obtained no blood. The deceased had been a patient in the asylum since the 1st of November last. His case was of a most desperate nature. He was always under apprehensions of some evil designs against him. He had refused food for six or seven days, thinking that it would be mixed with poison. His obstinacy in that particular was so strong, that his rations were obliged to be administered by means of a tube. The deceased had been Lieutenant in the 95th Regiment, or Rifle Corps, and had served under the Duke of Welling-

ton in all his campaigns: he was a very enterprising officer, and had received great patronage from the late Duke of Kent. His father was a General in the British service. The deceased had been of a very free disposition, which is supposed in a great degree to have brought on the direful malady.

A Juryman thought that the patients would be prevented from laying violent hands on themselves, if, instead of the wire grating being over the door, a shutter with a round hole in the middle was substituted; the ventilation would be just the same.

The whole of the Jurors being of the same opinion, Mr. Wright, the superintendent, was requested to state the opinion of the Jury to the Committee of Governors at the next meeting, which Mr. Wright promised to do.

The Jury afterwards consulted, and returned a verdict that the deceased "Hanged himself, being at the time in a state of desperate madness."—*Times*, April 5.

Royal Marriage.—Carolina, the Crown Princess of Denmark, was born on the 28th of Oct. 1793. As the youngest of the eight children, with which her mother, who was born on the 29th of October, 1767, has presented her husband, is now 14 years of age, it is very improbable that any male issue from this marriage will disturb the succession of the Crown Princess to the Throne of Denmark, which descends to females as well as males. The idea of eventually devolving through this projected marriage, to the Crown of Britain has, we understand, filled the Danes with the utmost alarm. Will Russia, interested in preventing the Sound from coming into our hands, dare to forbid the nuptials.

The Genuine Speech of Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury at the head of the men of Kent, to William, the Norman Conqueror.—"You are accosted, Illustrious General, by the Men of Kent, who are ready to submit to your Government, provided you will make proper concessions to their most equitable demands, being such sort of men as are determined to retain that liberty they have received from their ancestors, together with the laws and customs of their country; neither will they be reduced to a state of servitude which they never experienced or endure a new Legislature, for they can bear a regal, but not a tyrannical authority. With their liberty therefore unassailed, their ancient laws and customs reserved to them receive the Men of Kent, not as a parcel of slaves, but subjects attached to you in loyalty and love. But if you attempt to deprive them of their freedom, deprive them of their lives also; for they had rather engage with you in a determined battle, and fall under enemies than in a Court of Justice under certain laws. For though the rest of the English can suffer slavery, to be free is the property of the Men of Kent. Four things should never flatter us—familiarity with Princes—the caress of woman—the smiles of our enemies—nor a warm day in winter; for these things are not of long duration. The body is a case wherein the soul is put like a sword in a scabbard; it is the sword you should value, not the scabbard."

American Ingenuity.—It is with pleasure we inform the public, that a new mathematical instrument has been recently invented by Mr. William Bollea, a young man of Griswold, in this State. —It is called a Trigonometer, and consists of three straight graduated rulers, and two graduated arches, and so adjusted as to admit of solving all the problems of plane trigonometry without calculation, and sooner than the mathematician, provided with tables, could turn a sine, tangent, secant, or logarithm of a number; and the result given by the instrument quite as exact as any traverse tables extant would give it in case of right angles, and all obtuse angles are solved by it with equal facility. Indeed, if well graduated verniers were applied, it must be as exact as calculations by the tables in common use; and enable the sailor, engineer, surveyor, architect, or carpenter, to solve all the problems in plane trigonometry, without studying the art, or having more learning than is necessary to keep a mechanic's book.—*Connecticut Courant*.

Yellow Fever.—The Board of Physicians of Barcelona, who assemble weekly to discuss questions relative to the yellow fever which prevailed so dreadfully at that place, persist in all their declarations that it is not contagious.—*National Advertiser*.

Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1822.

MARRIAGE OF UNITARIAN DISSENTERS.

Mr. BROUGHAM presented a petition from the Unitarian Dissenters of Kendal, in Westmoreland, complaining that certain parts of the provisions of the Marriage Act pressed on their consciences, and praying to be placed upon the same footing in that respect with the Jews and Quakers in England, and with the Unitarian Dissenters in Scotland and Ireland.—Read, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. W. SMITH had brought forward his present measure in consequence of various petitions presented on the subject; but before he opened his proposition to the house, he would beg to put in two petitions similar to that presented by the honourable and learned member (Mr. Brougham)—the one from Sheffield, in Yorkshire, the other from Stopford, in the county of Durham.

The petitions having been read and ordered to be printed, Mr. W. SMITH proceeded. In bringing forward the present motion, he should begin by stating, as briefly as possible, the grievances of which the petitioners complained. Their complaint was that by the regulations of the act of the 26th George II., commonly called the Marriage Act, they were placed in a situation painful to themselves and different from that in which, previous to the passing of that act, they had been accustomed and permitted to stand. It would scarcely be denied by any one that marriage was a civil ceremony. It was so considered, not only by the common law, but by the canon law; and from the period of the year 1753, up to the passing of the act now complained of, marriages solemnized by the Dissenters in their own places of worship had been held good and valid. The act of the 26th Geo. II., however, enacting that every marriage, to be held legal, must be solemnized in the church, by the ministers of the church, and according to the ritual of the church, completely deprived the Dissenters of their before enjoyed privileges. He (Mr. Wm. Smith) was one of the class of persons now praying to be relieved from the pressure of that act, and it was important to those persons as a class, that, coming before Parliament, they should stand *rectus in curia*. He begged then to aver, that the Dissenters were unarraigned of any crime, and that they had as good a title to worship God in their own way as any members of the Church of England. Marriage was the natural right of the human species, and neither man nor woman, without the grossest injustice, could be deprived of its benefits. Yet the act of the 26th Geo. II. said to the Dissenters, "You shall comply with terms which are contrary to the dictates of your consciences, or you shall forego the advantage of that natural right." Such a holding was most unjust. It was not without precedent, because the same course had been pursued under Louis XIV., towards the Protestants of France. The measure in France, however, though unjust, was not so inconsistent as the law in England; because the Government of that country recognized at the time no religion but the Roman Catholic. To presume every Frenchman a Roman Catholic was most unjust; but, such being the presumption, there was no inconsistency in saying that members of the Roman Catholic church should be married according to its rites in England, however, there was a gross and palpable inconsistency about the arrangement. At the very time when the act of Geo. II. passed, the Dissenters had the benefit of the act of toleration. At that time it so happened that the Unitarian Dissenters were in small numbers, so small, indeed that they had not a place of worship (so called) belonging to them; but the Jews and the Quakers were especially exempted from the provisions of the act. The Jews could scarcely, perhaps, be called dissenters from the Church of England—the Church of England might, indeed, more properly be called dissenters from them, for they were the more ancient—but the Quakers were, to all intents and purposes, a sect dissenting from the Church of England, and they could have no right to any exemptions in which the Unitarians were not entitled to participate. By the canon law, marriage was nothing else but a civil contract. This was stated by high authority in this country, when, in 1813, a question respecting the validity of a Scottish marriage was discussed. The opinion of the Lord Chancellor was that the Scottish law was founded on the canon law, which was the foundation of the laws respecting marriage throughout Europe, and which regarded marriage as a contract. There was no doubt whatever but the Scottish law considered a marriage by consent of parties, and in presence of witnesses, to be as valid as if it were by any clergyman. The marriage act for its object the prevention of clandestine marriage. With that object he wished not to interfere, and he would therefore only propose the alteration of the religious ceremonies were common to all nations, and were highly proper, but they were not necessary. As a proof of that he might refer to the decree of Pope Innocent III. in Council, which declared the religious solemnity not to be necessary to the validity of marriages. But the religious ceremony ought to be in unison with the feelings of the parties. The ritual of the Church of England was derived from the Romish Church. Now to make that ritual a necessary part of the marriage, or religious objection existed to it, was a positive absurdity. He

proposed leaving out the whole of that part of the ritual which stated opinions on which the petitioners dissented from the Church of England. As he understood from the noble lord that his motion would not be opposed, he thought it unnecessary to go into further discussion of the subject now. He might, however mention, that the wisdom of our ancestors had enacted burning alive as the punishment for Christians marrying Jews. When that law was repealed and some time previously more persons were found to contend for its justice, and even humanity, than could now be found to advocate the part of the present law, which he wished to alter. He concluded by moving for leave to bring in a bill altering certain points in the 26th Geo. II. commonly called the Marriage Act.

The Marquis of LONDONDERRY wished not to be understood to pledge himself to the support of the measure.

Mr. H. GURNEY did not see what possible objection there could be to Unitarians being married by their own clergymen. The whole service would then be suited to their own sentiments, and, being regularly proclaimed in the church, no inconvenience could arise from it. On the other hand, there were many objections to parties having the service performed by clergymen of a different persuasion. He wished, therefore, that instead of such a measure as was now proposed, the hon. and learned gent. opposite would embrace the subject in his bill.

Mr. W. SMITH explained.

Leave was given to bring in the bill

Mirror of Fashion.

— TO SHEW
THE VERY AGE AND BODY OF THE TIME,
ITS FROTH AND PRESSURE.

BRIGHTON, APRIL 7, 1822.

After the Pavilion had for one whole week exhibited during the evenings a gloom, scarcely "darkness visible," it was enlivened on Saturday by the arrival of a number of Noble guests from town, who came down to dine with the King. Lord Lauderdale, Lord Bathurst, the Duke of Wellington, Lord St. Helens, Prince Esterhazy, the Marquess of Anglesea, Duke of Dorset, and some others. The Marquess of Londonderry and Lord Liverpool were expected, but they were detained in town, expecting a Messenger with dispatches from Vienna. The Pavilion was illuminated from one end to the other, and the Concert in the Great Music Room after dinner, embraced the usual splendid band selected by his Majesty. The King is said to enjoy excellent health, although his extremely domestic and retired habits prevent his shewing himself to his anxious and expecting people. This day the Royal Chapel was crowded. A sermon was preached by Dr. Peirson. The Royal pew, in addition to his Majesty, contained the Dukes of Wellington and Dorset, the Marquesses of Anglesea and Conyngham, Lords Bathurst, St. Helens, Lauderdale, Mount-Charles, and Francis Conyngham. On the left sat the Marchioness of Conyngham and her lovely daughters; the Ladies Paget, Bathurst, and family were in the same pew.

Lord John Russell, Lord Sefton and his family, Lord and Lady Grantham, Lord and Lady Cowper, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Creevey, Hon. W. Lamb, and other celebrated Members of the Whig party are here.

Sir Benjamin Bloomfield, decorated with his new Order of the Bath, together with Sir Edmund Nagle, and General Thornton, occupied the back part of the Royal pew at the Chapel on Sunday.

Sunday being Easter Sunday, the Princess AUGUSTA went from her residence at Frogmore to Windsor, and attended Divine Service at St. George's Chapel, and heard a Sermon preached by the Hon. and Rev. Mr. STOPFORD. Her Royal Highness received the Sacrament.

Yesterday morning the Princess AUGUSTA arrived in town from Frogmore, at her apartments in the King's Palace, Piccadilly, and remained some time.

The Duke of NORFOLK left town yesterday, for his seat, Fronsham-Suffolk.

The Duke of MONTROSE had a select party at his house in Grosvenor-square.

The Earl and Countess SPENCERS have left town for their seat at Wimbledon, for the holidays.

Viscount GRANVILLE left town yesterday for Newmarket, and her Ladyship on a visit to the Duke and Duchess of BEAUFORT, at their seat in Oxfordshire.

Lord BELGRAVE entertained a distinguished party yesterday, at his house in Grosvenor-square.

Lord and Lady FORRESTER have arrived in Sackville-street, from the Duke of Rutland's seat, Belvoir Castle.

Lord St. HELEN left town yesterday for the Pavilion, Brighton.

Sir CHARLES and Lady LONG have left town for their seat, Bromley Hill, Kent, for the holidays.

Sir WILLIAM and Lady A'COULT and suite have arrived at the Pulteny Hotel, Piccadilly from Naples; — CROMPTON, Esq. has left ditto his seat in Yorkshire.

MISCELLANEOUS.

—85—

Political Economy.

INQUIRY INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH DETERMINE THE RATE OF PROFIT.

Profits of stock fall because land equally fertile cannot be obtained; and through the whole progress of society, profits are regulated by the difficulty or facility of procuring food.—RICARDO.

In a former Number of this Paper, we endeavoured to shew that the average rate of profit affords an infallible criterion of national prosperity. It does this, because it enables us to estimate, with the greatest precision, the power which the country possesses of adding to its capital, or to its means of supporting and employing productive labourers. If the capital of the country, that is, if the supply of food and clothes, of tools and machines, be all required for the maintenance and employment of the existing labourers, it is plainly impossible that any additions can be made to their number, unless capital be previously augmented, without depressing the condition of the whole. But it is on the rate of profit that the rate of the increase of capital must always depend. Wherever the rate of profit is high, or, which is precisely the same thing, wherever industry is uncommonly productive, there is a rapid increase of capital and population: And, on the other hand, where the rate of profit is low, and industry comparatively unproductive, there is a proportionably diminished power of accumulation and of affording employment to additional labourers: and the progress of such a country, if it be not altogether stationary or declining, must, at all events, be extremely slow. The examples of the United States, and of Holland, shew that this is not mere theoretical reasoning; and prove, beyond all question, that the rate of profit is the grand regulator of national prosperity. Increase this rate, and you instantly increase the means of adding to the stock of the country, to the number of its inhabitants, and to their wealth:—diminish this rate, and you as instantly lessen the increase of the only fund from which the productive classes can obtain their share of the necessities, conveniences, and enjoyments of life; and poverty and misery will be general throughout the country, until the habits of the people be changed, and the increase of population proportioned to the diminished demand for labour. When therefore, we have ascertained the circumstances which determine the rate of profit, we shall really have ascertained those on which the numbers, happiness and comfort of mankind must ever mainly depend.

Dr. SMITH was of opinion, that the rate of profit varied inversely as the amount of capital, or, in other words, that it was always greatest where capital was least abundant, and lowest where capital was most abundant. He supposed, that according as capital increased, the principles of competition would stimulate capitalists to endeavour to encroach on the employments of each other: and that, in furtherance of their object they would be tempted to offer their goods at a lower price, and to give higher wages to their workmen—(Wealth of Nations, vol. ii. p. 28.) This theory was long universally assented to, and has been ably supported by M. SAY, Mr. MALTHUS, and others. We are satisfied, however, that it is utterly without foundation; and we have little doubt that such of our readers as have studied Mr. RICARDO's great work with the attention it deserves, are of the same opinion. Our limits will not allow us to enter fully into this important and difficult subject; but we apprehend it will not require any very elaborate argument to shew, that this is one of the few instances in which Dr. SMITH has mistaken effects for causes; and that a reduced rate of profit is never a consequence of an increase of capital, but always of a diminution of the capacity to employ capital with advantage, resulting either from a decrease in the fertility of the soils which must be taken into cultivation in the progress of society, or from an increase of taxation.

Mr. MALTHUS has demonstrated, that population has a constant tendency not only to equal, but to exceed the means of subsistence. But if the supply of labourers be always increased in proportion to every increase in the demand for their labour, it is plain the mere accumulation of capital could never sink profits by raising wages—that is, by increasing the labourer's share of the commodities produced by him. It is true, a sudden increase of capital would, by causing an unusually great demand for labourers, raise wages and lower profits: but such a rise of wages could not be permanent; for the additional stimulus it would give to the principle of population, would, as Mr. MALTHUS has shewn, by proportioning the supply of labour to the increased demand, infallibly reduce wages to their former level. If, therefore it were possible always to employ additional capital in the raising of raw produce, in the manufacturing of that raw produce when raised, and in the conveying of the raw and manufactured products from place to place, with an equal return, it is evident, supposing taxation to continue invariable, that no conceivable increase of the national capital could occasion the slightest fall in the rate of profit. So long as labour is obtainable at the same rate, and so long as the productive power of that labour is not diminished, so long must the profits of stock continue unaffected. Assuming, then, that the mere increase of capital has no lasting effect on wages, it must obviously be the

same thing, in so far as the rate of profit is concerned, whether ten or ten thousand millions be employed in the cultivation of the soil, in the manufactures, and commerce of this, or any other kingdom, provided the last million so employed be as productive, or yields as large a return as the first. And such is always the case with the capital employed in manufactures and commerce. The greatest possible amount of capital and labour may be employed in the working up of raw produce, or in fitting and adapting it to our use, and in transporting it from where it is produced to where it is to be consumed, without a diminished return. If a given quantity of labour will now build a ship of a given burden, or construct a machine of a given power, it is certain that an equal quantity of labour will at any future period be able to build a similar ship, or to construct a similar machine; and it is also certain, that although these ships and machines should be multiplied to infinity, the last would be equally well adapted for every useful purpose, and equally powerful and efficient as the first. The probability, indeed, or rather, we should say, the certainty is, that the last would be much more powerful than the first. No possible limit can be assigned to the powers and resources of genius, to the improvement of machinery, and of the skill and industry of the labourer. Future WATTS, ARKWRIGHTS, and WOODHOUSES, will arise; and the stupendous discoveries of the last and present age will doubtless be equalled, and perhaps surpassed, in those which are to come. It is, therefore, clear to demonstration, that if equal quantities of capital and labour could always raise equal quantities of raw produce, the utmost additions to the capital of the nation could never diminish the capacity to employ that capital with advantage, or sink the rate of profit. But here, and here only, the bounty of nature is limited, and she deals out her gifts with a frugal and parsimonious hand.

————— Pater ipse colendi
Haud facilem esse viam voluit ———

Equal quantities of capital and labour do not always obtain equal quantities of raw produce. In raising it, man has to contend with constantly increasing difficulties. The soil is of limited extent, and of still more limited fertility. In every advancing country, the most fertile lands are speedily brought under cultivation, and recourse must then be had to lands of a less degree of fertility, or which yield less produce in return for the same expenditure. It is this limited fertility of the soil that proves the real check—the insuperable obstacle—which prevents the means of subsistence and the inhabitants of every country from increasing, in a geometrical progression, until the space required for carrying on the operations of industry should become deficient. Whenever more labour is required to raise a given quantity of corn, or other raw produce, its exchangeable value is increased, and the manufacturers are obliged to give a greater quantity of their goods, in the production of which no great labour is required, in exchange for the same quantity of raw produce. Although, therefore, it were possible for wages to continue stationary after this rise, it is obvious that the profits of the manufacturing and commercial classes would be diminished, or that they would have a less command of raw produce after the rise than before. But if the value of raw produce be increased in proportion to the greater difficulty of its production, it may perhaps be supposed that this will, at least secure to the agriculturist the same rate of profit as before, and that it is the manufacturer only who will suffer. Such, however, is not the case. There cannot be a permanent difference in the profits obtained from different businesses in the same country. Wherever land of the second degree of fertility is cultivated, all the excess of produce yielded by the best land above that which is yielded by the worst goes to the proprietor of the first as rent; and the rise in the price of raw produce being only proportioned to the increased quantity of labour required to cultivate the inferior land, and not to the increased price at which that labour may be paid, it cannot indemnify the farmers for any increase that may have taken place in the wages of labour. It is absolutely certain, however, that wages will rise with a rise in the price of raw produce, caused by increased difficulty of production. Raw produce forms a principal part of the subsistence of the labourer, and it is utterly impossible to go on increasing its price, by taking inferior soils into cultivation, without also increasing his wages. A rise of wages is seldom or never exactly coincident with a rise in the price of necessities, but they can never be very far separated. Whatever may be the increased cost of necessities, the labourers must always receive such a quantity of them as is sufficient to enable them to support themselves and to continue their race. The price of the necessities of life is, in fact, the cost of producing labour. The labourer cannot work if he is not supplied with the means of subsistence. And although a certain period of greater or less extent, according to the circumstances of the country at the time, must always elapse, when necessities are rising in price, before wages can be proportionably augmented, there can be no question but that, in the end, such an augmentation will be brought about. Now, as rent is nothing but the excess, or the value of the excess, of the produce obtained from the best, above that obtained from the very worst soils in cultivation, it is plain it does not enter into the cost of production, and can have no influence whatever on prices. Wages and

profits, independently of rent, make up the whole value of every commodity. They must, therefore, vary inversely as each other, and can be affected by no extrinsic cause. When wages rise, profits must fall; and when wages fall, profits must rise. But we have shown that there is never any falling off, but a constant increase, in the efficiency of the labour employed in manufacturing and preparing raw produce. And such being the case, it is demonstrably certain, that the subsistence of the labourer could never be increased in price, and consequently that no additions could ever be made to his wages, were it not for the diminished power of agricultural labour, originating in the inevitable necessity under which we are placed, of resorting to poorer soils to obtain raw produce as society advances. The constantly decreasing fertility of the soil is, therefore, at bottom, the true and only natural cause of a fall of profits. Profits would never fall if wages were not increased; and wages would never be increased were it not for the decreasing fertility of the soil, and the consequent increase of the labour necessary to obtain corn and other raw products.

Thus, in every case, agricultural, as well as manufacturing profits, are lowered by the rise of wages which the increased cost of raising raw produce never fails to produce. The farmer gets no additional value for the corn which remains to him after paying rent, the manufacturer gets no additional value for the goods which he manufactures, and yet they are both obliged to pay a greater value in wages. Can any point, then, be more clearly established than that profits must fall as wages rise, and *vice versa*.

It is necessary, however, to observe, that although profits depend on wages, they do not depend on wages estimated in money, in corn, or any other commodity, but on *proportional wages*, that is, on the share of the commodities produced by the labourer, or of their value, which is given to him. It is, indeed, easy to see that proportional wages may be increased, at the same time the wages, if estimated in corn, or any other necessary, would be found to be diminished; and, in point of fact, such is almost uniformly found to be the case when recourse is had to poor soils. Suppose that the produce obtained from a given amount of capital applied to the land last taken into cultivation in America yields 100 quarters, the labourer will perhaps receive 60 quarters, or 60 per cent. of the produce as his wages. But the same amount of capital, if applied to the land last taken into cultivation in Britain, would not yield more than 50 quarters; and supposing the labourer to get only 40 quarters, or 20 quarters less than in America, still his *proportional wages*, or the wages which determine the rate of profit, would be 80 per cent., or 20 per cent. higher than in America. In the early stages of society, and wherever the best lands only are cultivated, proportional wages are always low and profits high; but these low proportional wages are always the most advantageous to the labourer, because, as labour is, in such circumstances, extremely productive, a small percentage of its total amount gives a large supply of necessities and conveniences. In the advanced stages of society, on the other hand, and wherever lands of a very inferior degree of fertility are cultivated, proportional wages are high and profits low; but owing to the increased difficulty of production, these high proportional wages form only a comparatively small supply of necessities and conveniences.

It is therefore on proportional wages that profits must always depend; and owing to the increasing difficulty of producing corn and other products, such proportional wages always increase as society advances. This natural tendency of profits to fall is occasionally checked by improvements in machinery, and by discoveries in agriculture; but the effects of these improvements are only temporary; for, by stimulating population, they never fail, in the long run, to force recourse to poor soils; and whenever this is the case, *profits must unavoidably fall*.

It has been contended, that both wages and profits are high in America, and that, therefore, the theory which we now have been endeavouring to explain, and which makes profits in every case to depend on wages, must be erroneous. But the remarks we have just made shew that this objection is totally unfounded. It is by proportional quantities, and not by absolute quantities, that we are to estimate the effect of wages on profits. The American labourer receives a less proportion of the produce raised by him than the British labourer, and profits are consequently high in America; but as the American labourer cultivates none but the best soils, and which yield a very large produce, his smaller share of this large aggregate produce gives him a great absolute quantity of necessities and conveniences, and his condition is therefore, comparatively prosperous.

We have, throughout this discussion, been supposing taxation to be invariable. It is plain, however, that as soon as it is increased, it must have one or other of two effects—it must either lower the labourer's command over necessities and luxuries, and degrade his condition, or it must fall on profits. There are limits, however, and those not very difficult to be attained, to the power of the labourers to pay taxes; and whenever these limits have been reached, they must entirely fall on profits. It has, therefore, been most justly and truly observed by Dr. Smith, that a heavy taxation has exactly the same effects as an increased barrenness of the soil, and an increased inclemency of the heavens.

High proportional wages and low profits, for they are inseparably connected, ought never to be made the subject of complaint, if they occur in the natural progress of society, under a parsimonious government, and a system of perfectly free intercourse with other countries. But if they are the result of heavy taxation earned by profuse expenditure, or by restrictions which prevent the importation of cheap foreign corn, and which, therefore, force the cultivation of inferior soils at home, they cannot be too strongly condemned. A nation placed in such circumstances must not only advance slowly, when compared with other nations which are enabled to raise their supplies of raw produce from superior soils—the power to accumulate capital must not only be diminished, but a strong temptation must be held out to transfer it to other countries. The love of country—the thousand ties of society and friendship—the ignorance of foreign languages, and the desire to have one's stock employed under their own inspection, will, no doubt, in very many instances, induce capitalists to rest contented with a *less* rate of profit in their own, than they might realise by investing their funds in other countries. But this love of country has its limits. The *love of gain*—the *aurea sacra fons*—is a no less powerful and constantly operating principle; and if capitalists are once assured that their stock can be laid out with equal security and with considerably greater advantage, in foreign states, an efflux of capital to a greater or less extent will unquestionably take place.

A manufacturing and commercial country, which has wisely adopted a liberal commercial system, has no reason to be alarmed at the effects of competition in any department of industry. The production of one commodity opens a market for the exchange, that is, for the sale of some other commodity. What a manufacturing and commercial nation has really to fear is, that its *average rate of profit* should fall lower than the average rate of profit in the neighbouring countries. If this should be the case, its progress will, in consequence, be retarded; and it will ultimately languish and decline. Neither the skill, industry, and perseverance of artisans, nor the most improved and powerful machinery, can permanently withstand the paralyzing and deadening influence of a comparatively low rate of profit. And such a comparative reduction, let it never be forgotten, will be constantly produced by a *comparatively heavy taxation*, and by acting on a *facitious and exclusive commercial system*; for by preventing the importation of cheap foreign corn, we necessarily force the cultivation of poor soils, and thus, by raising proportional wages, sink profits.—*Scottsman*, April 6.

Catholic Peers.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

SIR,

I beg leave to offer to the public, through the medium of your Paper, some general reflections which have occurred to me, and I believe to many others, in consequence of Mr. Canning's announcing his intended Bill to repeal so much of the Act of the 30th Car. II. as requires Peers to take the Oath of Supremacy, and to make the Declaration against Transubstantiation, the Mass, and the Invocation of Saints, before they sit and vote in Parliament.

Passing by the Oath of Supremacy, I shall confine myself to the Declaration. But it is not my intention to discuss any of the points of religious controversy involved in it; nor do I mean to consider it with any reference to the alleged hardship of requiring it from Catholic Peers. I will suppose, that the doctrines renounced by the Declaration are what it describes them, and that the refusal of the Declaration excludes, justly and properly, every Peer who refuses to make it, from the House of Lords. All I shall contend for is, that requiring any Peer to make it, is unholy and unjust.

The Declaration is a solemn affirmation; it is accompanied by an adjuration of the Divine Being to witness it, and the party's belief that what he affirms in it is true. The declaration, therefore, is a sacred act of religion.

Every person who makes this Declaration, swears, that "he doth believe that there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whomsoever;" and that "the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous." The Act, which enjoins this Declaration, requires that it should be made and sworn to by every Peer, before he takes his seat, or votes in Parliament.

All of your readers will admit, that to make and swear to this Declaration with a safe conscience, the person who makes and swears to it, should have a clear and precise knowledge of the meaning of *all* the words which it contains, and should therefore clearly understand what the words Sacrament, Transubstantiation, Invocation, Adoration and the Sacrifice of the Mass, mean in the sense in which they are propounded in the Declaration.

Now, can it be gravely said that this is the case?

1st. As a preliminary observation, I may remark, that the Declaration expressly terms that religious rite, which is called our Lord's Supper, a Sacrament. But the disciples of Hoadley (and they unquestionably form a large proportion of the establishment) deny even the existence of a Sacrament. They declare that it is a word without a meaning. When, therefore, in the Declaration they call our Lord's Supper a Sacrament, they call it that which they themselves affirm to have no existence. Can any who are of opinion make the Declaration with a safe conscience?

2. Without dwelling on this point (which, however, seems to deserve some consideration, permit me to ask, if a person can conscientiously affirm upon his oath, that "there is not any transubstantiation in the Sacrament," unless by due enquiry he has previously ascertained that there is none?

To ascertain this, he must settle that the word transubstantiation uniformly means the absolute annihilation of one substance, and the substitution of another in its place; and that it is never used by approved writers to mean the transference of one substance into another. If the word transubstantiation bear the latter meaning, no Protestant, who believes the real presence (and all Protestants profess to believe it), can conscientiously swear, or even simply affirm the negative. Now, that the word transubstantiation will bear the latter meaning, some of the most eminent lights of the Established Church are agreed.* Then is it decent, or is it consistent with the sacredness of an oath to swear to the belief of the contrary, without any limitation or explanation whatever?

3. Other words in the Declaration are fair subject for a similar inquiry. Admitting, however (but we humbly conceive this is not always the case), that the party who make the Declaration fully understand the meaning of all these words, can he, with a safe conscience, declare upon his oath, that the sacrifice of the Mass, the Invocation of the Virgin Mary, the other saints, as used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous?

Surely, to make this Declaration upon oath with a safe conscience, a person should possess a clear knowledge of the doctrines of the Church of Rome in her own decrees. Now, those only can be said to have this knowledge, who have read the expositions given of them by the Church of Rome in her own decrees, or by her own approved writers. How very few have examined either?

We shall first consider Transubstantiation and the Mass. Dr. Taylor, the Bishop of Down, than whom, the whole Protestant Church boasts no fair name, and who had fully examined the points in question, declared, after his examination of them, that the doctrine of the Catholic Church upon them was not idolatrous†. "The object," says this learned and eloquent Prelate, "of their adoration in the Sacrament, is the only true and eternal God, hypostatically united with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of the Sacrament; and if they thought him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread, that they profess it idolatry to do so. This is demonstration, that the soul has nothing in it that it is idolatrical; the will has nothing in it that is not a great enemy to idolatry." Thornelyke, the learned Prebendary of Westminster,‡ speaks indignantly of the charge of Idolatry brought against Catholics for their belief of Transubstantiation. "Will any papist (says this distinguished writer) acknowledge that he honours the elements of the Eucharist for God? Will common sense charge him with honouring that in the Sacrament which he believes not to be there?" "It is a monstrous error (says Bishop Cevin, &c), to deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist."

Many other Protestant authorities to the same effect might be cited; but this is not a place for such citations. We must, however, beg leave to add Bishop Ken's Exposition, licensed in 1635.—O God incarnate! how thou canst give us thy flesh to eat, and thy blood to drink! how thy flesh is meat indeed; how thou who art in heaven are present upon the altar, I can by no means explain; but I firmly believe it all, because thou hast said it.

Where such high authorities concur in a liberate and solemn opinion upon any subject, it certainly is allowable to dissent from them; but is it allowable, is it decent, is it even safe to affirm a contrary opinion upon oath?—To do it after a long and serious examination is some-

* See the Essay on Catholic Communion, 8vo., the work of a Protestant Divine, first published in the year 1704. The third and best edition was printed in 1812. In referring to this work, I refer also to the authorities in it.

† In his Liberty of Prophecy, sec. 20.

‡ Just Weights and Measures, ch. 19.

§ History of Transubstantiation.

what hazardous; to do it without any examination must be rashness in the extreme.

What would the Barons of the Exchequer have said of a person who, on a late trial for the adulteration of Beer, had sworn that no Quassia had been infused into it, and had afterwards confessed on cross-examination, that he took what he said upon trust, and had himself never examined the composition? Where is the real difference between the cases? Does it require less certitude to swear? But the awfulness of the subject withholds me from pursuing the interrogation.

We may ask, whether, if idolatry be justly chargeable on transubstantiation, it be not chargeable, with equal justice, on consubstantiation, and impanation, in one or other of which every Protestant believes? If it be chargeable on these doctrines, it evidently follows that, when a person swears transubstantiation to be idolatrous, he equally swears to his belief, that all, who maintain the doctrine of the real presence, whether Catholic or Protestant, are idolatrous; that all his own Catholic ancestors were idolatrous; that all existing Roman Catholics are idolatrous; that the fathers of the Established Church of England, Cramer, Ridley, and the other Protestant Divines, who framed the Communion Services in 1548, were idolatrous; that Queen Elizabeth, who patronized the doctrine of the real presence, was an idolator; that the eminent divines, who, by her desire, framed the 39 Articles and the Liturgy in terms designedly so comprehensive as to let in the believers of transubstantiation, were idolatrous; and (if we believe Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derry) that "all true believers of the genuine doctrine of the church of England are idolatrous." "No genuine son of that church (says that celebrated prelate)*, did ever deny a true real presence.

If idolatry is chargeable on consubstantiation as much as it is on transubstantiation (and it would most assuredly be found difficult to shew that it is not), then, as consubstantiation is an acknowledged tenet of the Augustan confession, and therefore received by every Lutheran, our late venerable Monarch married an idolator.

4. Thus far respecting Transubstantiation and the Mass; we proceeded to the doctrine of the Invocation of the Virgin Mary and other Saints.

We have seen that every person, who makes the Declaration, affirms upon Oath his belief, that these doctrines, as they are used in the Church of Rome, are "idolatrous and superstitious."

But, of those, who thus swear this doctrine of the Church of Rome, to be idolatrous and superstitious, how few, how very few, have taken due pains to ascertain it! I beg leave to state this doctrine of the Catholic Church in a very few lines, from authorities, which all must allow to be unquestionable.

It was thus defined at the Council of Trent, by the Pope and nearly 300 Roman Catholic prelates assembled from every part of the Catholic world. "The Saints, reigning with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for men; it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers, help and assistance, to obtain favour from God through his son Jesus Christ our Lords, who is alone our Redeemer and Saviour."

In conformity to this doctrine, the Catechism of Pope Pius V. teaches, that "God and the Saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner; for, we pray to God that he himself would give us good things; and deliver us from evil things; but we beg of the Saints (because they are pleasing to God), that they would be our advocates and obtain from him what we stand in need of."—This is most explicitly taught in all our Catechisms. Roman Catholic children, in their very first Catechism, are asked the following questions, and give the following answers: Q. "Does the second Commandment forbid the making of Images?" A. "It forbids the making of them so as to adore them; that is, it forbids making them our Gods." Q. "Does this Commandment forbid all honour and veneration of the Saints and Angels?" A. "No. We are to honour them as God's special friends and servants, but not with the honour that belongs to God." The Catechisms for the Adult express the same doctrine, but in stronger terms. Dr. Challoner's "Summary of Christian Doctrine," prefixed to "The Garden of the soul." The most popular prayer-book of the English Roman Catholics, lays down the same doctrine; and, in "The Papist Misrepresented and Represented," published by the Rev. Mr. Gother, our most eminent controversialist in the 17th century, and often republished by Dr. Challoner the 17th Edition of it is now before me), the following anathema is pronounced against the idolatrous worship of the Saints:—"Cursed is he that believes the Saints in Heaven to be his Redeemers; that prays to them as such; or that gives God's honour to them; or to any creature whatsoever!—Amen!"

Here then, let me ask, serious Protestant, who peruses these lines, whether, after duly considering these passages (and a thousand like them might be produced to him), he can honourably and conscientiously, even

* Answer to Militiere's Triumph of Truth, p. 74.

In common conversation, charge idolatry on the doctrine of the Catholic Church, thus solemnly, explicitly, and authoritatively professed and explained by herself?

Several of the most eminent Protestant Divines have acquitted the Catholics of this charge. Dr. Luther acquainted them of it: Archbishop Sheldon, Bishops Blandford, Gunning, Montagu, and many other of the brightest lights of the Established Church have acquitted them of it. Bishop Montagu, in particular, owns that the Blessed in Heaven do recommend to God in their prayers, their kindred, friends and acquaintance on earth. "This," saith the Learned Prelate, "is the common voice with the general concurrence, without contradiction of reverend and learned antiquity for aught I ever could read or understand; and I see no cause or reason to dissent from them, touching intercession on this kind."

The faculty of the Lutheran University of Helmstadt acquitted them offit. On the marriage of the Princess Christina of Wolfenbüttele, a Lutheran, with the Archduke of Austria, her Court consulted that faculty, "whether a Protestant Princess, destined to marry a Catholic Prince, could, without wounding her conscience, embrace the Roman Catholic religion?" the faculty replied, that "it could not answer the proposed question, in a solid manner, without having previously decided, whether the Catholics were or were not engaged in errors, that were fundamental, or opposed to salvation? Or, which was the same thing, whether the state of the Catholic Church were such, that persons might practise in it, the true worship of God, and arrive at salvation?" The question thus raised by them, the divines of Helmstadt discussed at length, and concluded in these terms:—"After having thus shewn, that the foundation of religion subsists in the Roman Catholic religion, so that a person may be orthodox in it, live well in it, die well in it, and obtain salvation in it, the decision of the proposed questions is easy—we are of opinion, that the Most Serene Princess of Wolfenbüttele may, in favour of her marriage, embrace the Catholic religion." This opinion is dated the 29th of April, 1687, and was printed in the same year, at Cologne. Now, if the doctrine of transubstantiation and the Mass, or of the invocation of the Saints, as they are used in the Church of Rome, were idolatrous and superstitious, persons could not practise in that church the true worship of God, or arrive in it at salvation; they could not be orthodox in it, or live well in it, or die well in it, or obtain salvation in it. But, in direct opposition to this theological oath of the British Legislature, the Lutheran Divines of Helmstadt, specially and solemnly consulted, declared, that the doctrines of transubstantiation, the mass, and the invocation of the saints, as used in the Church of Rome, are not idolatrous or superstitious; and assured an illustrious Brunswicker, that, in the church professing them, she might safely live, and safely die.

I shall cite two more Protestant authorities—they apply equally to transubstantiation and the mass, and to the invocation of saints. Leibniz (certainly one of the greatest literary characters whom the world has produced) has, in his *System Theologicum*, recently published at Paris, discussed with admirable precision and candour, all the controverted tenets of Catholic faith. After so discussing the Eucharistic doctrine of the Catholics, he says, "It is not to be doubted that all persons might, with reason and consistency, adore God appearing in the visible form of Christ. It would be the same, if it were certain that Christ were bodily present; for the divinity is present at all times, and in all places. Now, it is assuredly certain, that this holds in the blessed Sacrament.—Then consequently, if ever it was particularly suitable, that adoration should be instituted." *Neque enim dubium est, quin omnes recte et congruenter adorarent apparentem visibili Christi forma Deum; idemque est, ubi constaret adesse Christum corpore suo, man divinitas nemper et ubique adest, etsi invisibili ration: Hoc autem certo utique constat evenire in sacratissimo sacramento Itaque, si unquam, tum certe maxime conveniens fuit adorationem institui.*

On the invocation of the saints, Leibniz is equally explicit. He first shews the limitation with which it is taught by the Church of Rome. He concluded that, "if the veneration and invocation of the saints is thus limited, it should not only be tolerated, but even approved, though it be not necessary." "This," he remarks, "certainly cannot be idolatrous or reprehensible, unless what greatly endangers faith, we take upon ourselves to affirm, that the true Church, notwithstanding the promises of Christ, fell, in its earliest times, into a horrible apostasy."

With one farther authority only I shall trouble my readers. I transcribe it from a work which most of them will acknowledge to be the most entertaining they have read.

Boswell—"What do you think of the Idolatry of the Mass?"

Johnson—"Sir, there is no idolatry; they believe God to be there, and adore him."

* For this and the other authorities referred to, see the Essay already cited—ch. 3.

The Life of Dr. Johnson by Mr. Boswell, vol. I. p. 561, 2d edit.

Boswell—"The Invocation of the Saints?"

Johnson—"They do not worship the Saints; they invoke them; they only ask their prayers."

Here, we pause—we repeat that it is far from our wish to discuss, or even to assert in this place, the truth of the Catholic doctrines on the points we have noticed: but—

Be that doctrine true, or be it false, can any person in his cool and deliberate judgement say, that the Legislature of the United Kingdom can worthily or wisely require any of its subjects to affirm, with the solemn asseveration of an oath, either the affirmative or the negative belief of a doctrine, upon which the highest authorities, even of their own Church, have been, are, and probably till the latest time will continue to be divided.

Surely the sacredness of an oath, which never should be taken, if the truth of what is sworn to admits of reasonable doubt, good sense, which is shocked by the language of the declaration, the terms of amity, which subsist between the United Kingdom and many Catholic States, and which render the declaration an uncivil State Paper—The littleness in wounding unnecessarily the feelings of that proportion of the community which is Catholic (for a Protestant is not more hurt at a Turk's calling him a Christian Dog, than a Catholic is at a Protestant's calling him an Idolator)—the impolicy of keeping any thing in existence, which unnecessarily insults and irritates—the acknowledged wisdom and expediency of every legislative or ministerial measure, which promotes a reciprocity of good will and conciliation, and above all THE MERITS—we confidently say it, THE MERITS OF THE CATHOLICS, seem to point out the propriety of repealing this objectionable and inefficient Declaration.

Roman Catholics.

To the Editor of the Times.

Sir,

In order to realize your "hopes" that the Catholic Church has not "thrown into abeyance" that part of the 1st Commandment which forbids the adoration of graven things (or, as you translate, *images*, although the Hebrew word *Pesah* signifies any sort of thing, whether the representative of any created being, or not). I enclose you a copy of the Decalogue, as I find it in an old Catholic Prayer-book. As the leaf likewise contains the *Ave Maria*, a prayer to the Blessed Virgin, in daily use amongst us, it will perhaps serve you to animadvert upon with your accustomed liberality. You will, no doubt, be able to show that the words "pray for us" &c. with which it concludes, signify the same as "have mercy on us," by which we address our Creator: for a person who can put an idolatrous construction on the merely bowing to an image, expressive of our veneration for the original, cannot find it difficult to put a similar construction on the other. But a *propos*!—A few days ago I was reading an account of Lord Amherst's late embassy to China, wherein I find the following anecdote:—It being required by the Minister of China, that the British Ambassador should perform the ceremony of knocking his head several times on the ground in the presence of the Chinese Emperor, such ceremony was objected to by Lord Amherst, as degrading to the British nation, as it implied an inferiority of England to China; but it was proposed, that the objection would be removed, provided the Chinese Minister would prostrate himself as many times before a picture of the Prince Regent (who has since ascended the throne), in order to show that both nations maintained an equality of dignity. Q. Did Lord Amherst wish the Chinese to break the commandment? which he must have done, had it borne the construction put upon it by yourself. Or, to come nearer home, are Peers or others idolaters when they bow down to the King's chair in the House of Lords? The answer by every rational man in either case, would be the complete negative. Blush, then, at sending forth such trash, which no man of any sense can be imposed upon by. With respect to the religion of the primitive Christians, if it was not the Roman Catholic, at any rate it could not be the Protestant, for it was only two or three years ago that they themselves were celebrating in different places, the third centenary of their existence as a religious body, which proves that 12 centuries must have elapsed since the close of the Pagan persecutions and the commencement of their religion.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

April 19.

ANOTHER ENGLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC.

MARRIAGES.

At St. Mary's Church, Bathwick, on the 11th of April, by the Rev. Francis Festing, Vicar of Winsham, Edmund Haynes, Esq., of the island of Barbadoes, to Lucy, third daughter of George Reed, Esq., of Dorch-four, Demerara, and Johnstone-street, Bath.

On the 15th of April, at St. Margaret's Westminster, Mr. William Eskridge, of Walworth, son of the late Rev. Anthony Eskridge, rector of Bedlestrophe, and vicar of Slesby, in the county of Lincoln, to Anne, eldest daughter of James Western, Broadway, Westminster.

Medical Attendance.

To the Editor of the Journal.

SIR,

It is matter of regret to see a man undertaking to instruct the public on a subject he himself is entirely ignorant of, and in this sentiment I am sorry, your Correspondent "ANOTHER LOVER OF JUSTICE," should in his well meant endeavours to assist a good cause, have fallen so very short of his object. Your Correspondent sets out by informing us that there are no regular Physicians in India, that Medical men in this country have only attained the rank of Apothecaries and Surgeons, and draws a concluding inference, that such individuals are not legally entitled to remuneration from their Patients, unless for drugs and Medicines supplied in the one case, and aid purely surgical administered in the other;—whereas, were one regular Physician or even *Bachelor of Medicine* in the country, he alone would be entitled to charge fees for professional attendance. This is truly unfortunate, however, for your *knowing* Correspondent, the fact of the case being directly the reverse.

From the most ancient times down to the present day, the Fees of Physicians, like those of Barristers, have always been looked upon as honorary rewards, or in the language of the Courts, honoraria; whereas Surgeons and Apothecaries have always been permitted to charge and pursue for payment in Courts of Law for their attendance on sick persons, whether their cases be Medical or Surgical.

In the days of ancient Rome, when the two faculties of Physic and Law became worthy of study and cultivation, the profession of both was eagerly followed by the highest and richest subjects of the State, who without fee or reward granted their advice and assistance gratuitously, merely for the honor attached to the pursuit of such liberal and useful professions. The two professions remained under this implied understanding, till modern times, when from the Pandects of Justinian, this view of the professors of Physic and of Law got incorporated with our English Code, in which it has hitherto remained unaltered.

In the progressive advancement of human knowledge, of luxury and refinement, and consequently of the more marked character of diseases, engendered from war, conquest, and travel abroad, and luxury at home, the healing art appeared more and more worthy of attention; hence Physicians and Surgeons increased in numbers, in time became a distinct class,—and trusted for their maintenance to public remuneration for their professional services.

Though this was acknowledged and voluntarily admitted on all sides, the Law, or custom, remained unchanged. The fees of Physicians and Barristers continued to be looked upon as sacred honorary rewards, to be paid on attendance or advice being given, and consequently not actionable or recoverable in the Courts. In this state the Law remains in English Jurisprudence, a Physician cannot therefore sue for a fee, and it is better that it is so. As the science of Physic advanced and improved, it naturally divided itself into several branches, such as the Medical, or treatment of internal diseases; the Surgical, or treatment of local or external diseases, and the Dietical and Pharmaceutical, or the science of aliment and food and the preparation of medicines. In former days, Surgical operations (speaking comparatively) were totally unknown, the dressing of a sore or superficial wound, the application of herbs, salves, and poultices, constituted the sum total of Surgical practice. Such being considered menial and unpleasant services, were left by Physicians to their servants and barbers, while the duties of Apothecaries were limited to the preparation of articles of diet and of drink, of salves, balsams, and herbs, according to the opinions of Physicians collected and embodied from time to time. Surgeons were in those days uneducated, illiterate men, and like the Surgeons among the Hindoos of the present day, were generally barbers by profession, shaving the hair and beard, cutting the toe-nails and dressing wounds, being aggregate duties. To the wonder and disgrace of our own country, this incorporation of

Surgeons and Barbers provided for by royal charter, in the reign of Henry VIII. remained undivided till the recent period of 1734, when an Act of Parliament was obtained for constituting the Colleges of Surgeons as distinct chartered corporations, but from some strange anomaly, Barber's apprentices have their names entered in the books of the College of Surgeons up to this day. Apothecaries are also on a most respectable footing; of late years they have a separate corporation authorised by Government, which empowers them to prevent any persons compounding or vending drugs, but such as are legalised by their statutes, which provides for their suitable education and knowledge, ascertained by trial and examination; the limits of their authority however I cannot at present recollect. The above is a hasty sketch of the profession of Physic as divided into the great branches, though it might be subdivided into many more, such as that of the oculist, midwife, dentist, &c. &c.

To return to your Correspondent, I regret exceedingly that he has not given us his definition of a regular Physician, and that he has been silly enough to hazard the assertion that there are no regular Physicians in Calcutta. Having myself used the term, I am bound to acquaint him with my definition, and beg to inform him that a regular Physician is one who has attained the highest honors in Medicine in consequence of regular attendance at an University, and who has with credit to himself undergone the trials prescribed by the established Laws and Regulations of such University. By the Laws of every country in Europe, Universities are allowed to confer the highest honorary degrees in the three faculties of Law, Physic, and Divinity; and I maintain, Sir, that whoever has obtained the degree of M. D. from any University in Great Britain, Ireland, or in the Continent of Europe, is to all intents and purposes a regular Physician, and moreover is entitled to practice as such all over the world, without further trial or examination, excepting where chartered Colleges of Physicians have obtained the sole prescriptive right of practising within certain defined limits, such as the Colleges of Edinburgh, Dublin, and London, in which places it is necessary to become a Licentiate or Member of the respective Colleges, previous to assuming practice within those limits.

So much for matter of fact.—Now, Mr. Editor, allow me to advert to the sneer and reasoning of your sapient Correspondent on Scottish Diplomas, who from introducing to our acquaintance *Bachelors of Medicine* supposes I presume that no one save a Graduate of far-famed Oxford or Cambridge can be in his opinion a regular Physician. Your Correspondent seems entirely ignorant of the distinction between a Surgeon's Diploma and an University Degree: the one, viz. a Diploma being a Certificate and license from the College of Surgeons to practise Surgery or to practise and follow the usual duties of a Surgeon all over the world, the other constituting him a regular Physician. These powers vested in a man by those respective bodies are granted only on due trial and qualified examination which the Laws of Great Britain have confirmed, and consequently legalize in all countries subject to Britain, while other countries always respect and legalize the license by acknowledgment and confirmation of it, as their Licentiates are acknowledged by us.

Your Correspondent also informs us that a Scottish Diploma gives neither claim nor right beyond that of an Apothecary, for, says he exultingly "in Scotland many Apothecaries are M. D's. as we all know." Now, by a similar conclusion, since many of the Scottish Clergy study Medicine and obtain the rank of M. D. for the use and great advantage it affords them in the exercise of humanity, independent of their regard for the valuable science of Medicine, he might have stated that a Scottish Diploma gives neither claim nor right beyond that of a Clergyman, for in Scotland there are many of the Clergy M. D's. as we all know!!

I presume, your Correspondent means here, by the word Diploma, (University Degree,) but he may be glad to learn that neither a Scotch Diploma nor Degree takes any cognisance of, or bears any reference to, the duties or calling of Apothecaries, whatsoever. Medical Candidates in that country, being always considered perfectly acquainted with that department of study, in like

manner as with Chemistry, Botany, and the Classics, previous to or during their Medical Studies, but on which they are very particularly examined as to attainment previous to License; neither would their ignorance on that score be passed over, tho' in being licensed they have no rank or injunction affecting them as Apothecaries. It is preposterous to say that because an M. D. dispenses Medicines to his patients he is by so doing a whit the less a Physician. In Country practice it must from the nature of things be so, in Town practice it is not necessary or practicable, and consequently not followed, but in reference to private patients. Perhaps your Correspondent will not allow that the late celebrated Dr. Gregory was a regular Physician, because forsooth he was not a Graduate of Oxford or of Cambridge, neither were the two Drs. Munro, Primis and Secundus, Sir Walter Farquhar, the present Drs. Bayley and Marcet, and a host of other Physicians now in London, because they have only Scotch Degrees. I suppose he argues that there are no regular Physicians in Paris or Vienna, in Berlin or Göttingen, &c. &c. No; they are of course Apothecaries, and if foreign Physicians, not regular Physicians. Such may be his doctrine, and likewise that there are no regular Physicians in India. As to this last point, however, I pity him for his ignorance, and beg to assure him that there are many regular Physicians in Calcutta, and in all parts of India, and would advise him to be a little more attentive to the bearing of any Medical question, before he again intrudes himself on the public.

One more subject, Sir, has in the words of your learned Correspondent "by accident found its way to the point of my pen," it is the popular ignorance fostered by the stage, which pervades all ranks and classes of people on the score of Scotch Diplomas, or as they ought to be called Scotch Medical Degrees; and a slur seems to hover over Scotland, on account of the three Universities of Aberdeen and St. Andrews being supposed to prostitute this academical honor. The three Universities in question are of ancient institution and anterior in foundation to that of Edinburgh. Long previous to the reformation, and indeed up to a comparatively recent period, these institutions were famed over all Europe for the learning and piety of their Professors, and for the study of Ethics, Philosophy, and classical learning. Every branch of human knowledge and polite literature were then taught with success. The Students resided and were maintained by the funds and laws of the Universities, while the Professors occasionally travelled to the various countries of Europe and brought back with them fresh accessions of knowledge and literature, wherever it was to be found. The science of Medicine, as then understood, was diligently cultivated in the abstract theoretical study of the day, honorary degrees were conferred on certain individuals, subsequent to their practical education being finished, for the acquisition of which they traversed for years to the Continent, and attended the schools of Paris and Lyden. Subsequent to the reformation, the lands of the Church and the Universities were seized and alienated, the means of support from both Professors and Students having thus dwindled away to nothing, these venerable institutions were deserted, while new Medical Schools sprung up in others quarters; the theoretical and practical study of Medicine then became united, the plan of study in these Seminaries was completely altered, and at last merged into a few classes for Classical Literature and Calvinistic Divinity, with an outline of Mathematics and Philosophy, little superior in the present day to an ordinary School, and which the Students only attend for a few hours a day during a short term of 5 months of the year. This unfortunate change in the Scotch Universities in no way interfered with their chartered prerogative of granting honorary degrees in the Three Faculties of Law, Divinity, and Physic, honors which they still confer, and I believe not unworthily.

We never hear of ridicule being attached to a man who has been dubbed a D. D. or L. L. D. be it from Scotch or English University; but an M. D. is a different thing I suppose, and ought to be reprobated. Now let us examine the question fairly and see the extent of this prostituted honor. I maintain therefore, without the fear of contradiction, that no one ever heard of a Captain

of the Army obtaining the degree of M. D. from Aberdeen and St. Andrews, nor of any other man who had not a regular Medical education, or any youth, be who he might, merely from his regular attendance at the classes of those Universities. I have already shown that any regular University can confer an honorary degree on the three learned professions, and consequently that those of Aberdeen and St. Andrews can, and that such are equally honorable with those from any other University, tho' not esteemed as such by the public. Since Medicine has ceased to be taught in them, Medical education must be acquired elsewhere; and for instance, suppose a man to have studied Medicine for a series of years at Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dublin, and London, and been licensed to practice as a Surgeon by either of these Colleges, but from want of time or money, or from other causes, has been induced to settle himself in Country practice, or to enter the Army or Navy, or proceed to the Colonies, either of which may have prevented him from attaining a Medical degree; he is at least anxious to attain that honor without loss of time and as cheaply as he can, he applies to Aberdeen and St. Andrews. Testimonials are required of him as to moral character, and to Medical education, and likewise that he has for a certain number of years practised as a Surgeon. Moreover, these testimonials must be furnished only by Medical men of well known ability and public character there, whom the world have put above all suspicion; they are delegated to examine the candidate, or rather the applicant, if occasions seem to require it, and on the faith and trust of these delegates, independent of what character the applicant may have secured for himself, the honor is conferred upon him. This is the true statement of the case, and I ask the question of any man, would such honorary degree confer any slur on a Medical Practitioner in Calcutta, were he anxious to have M. D. attached to his name and vouched for in the above manner by the most respectable and best known of his brethren in India?

At the University of Edinburgh, Medical Education is certainly more complete than at any other School in Europe, and this is exemplified by the number of Students there, and the countries from which they come. One half of the Doctors in Medicine annually created at Edinburgh are Englishmen, while Russians, Irish, Spaniards, Portuguese, Dutch, and Germans, constitute a third of the remainder,—their superior acquirements are universally admired in the British Army and Navy, in the Colonies in India, and particularly in England, where to the disgrace of the Country, there is no regular Medical School—no fixed plan, basis, or course of study—every one being left to his own free choice of attending Lectures and Hospitals, and where nothing is looked upon as worthy of attention, but Anatomy and the Mechanical part of Surgery. The famous Schools of Oxford and Cambridge, in a Medical point of view, are exactly the same as Aberdeen and St. Andrews. As they have neither Lectures, Dissections, Hospitals, or in short, the slightest semblance of Medical Education. Yet 7 years' nominal attendance there confers the only sublime degree of M. D. in the world, and is as truly meritorious in acquisition as the honor of L. L. D. conferred a few years ago on the magnanimous Alexander, Emperor of all the Russias—I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

On the River, August 29. 1822.

CIVIS.

Jamne igitur laudas quod se sapientibus unus ridebat? Juvenal.

CURRENT VALUE OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Remittable,.....	19 6 a 10 4
Non-Remittable,.....	11 4 a 11 8

PRICE OF BULLION.

Spanish Dollars,	Sicca Rupees 205 0 a 206 0 per 100
Dubloons,	30 8 a 31 8 each
Joos, or Pezas,	17 8 a 17 12 each
Dutch Ducats,	4 4 a 4 12 each
Louis D'Ors,	8 4 a 8 8 each
Silver 5 Franc pieces,	190 4 a 190 8 per 100
Star Pagodas,	3 6½ a 3 7 6 each
Sovereigns,	9 8 a 10 0
Bank of England Notes,	9 8 a 10 0

To Critics.

I beg, Sir, you will let me alone, I assure you I am not acting a part; and I am not therefore within your range, but as you may think yourself entitled to some reply, because, in truth, you are pleading your own cause, give me leave to ask you a plain question or two on the subject.

Is it possible that Reviewers can be ignorant of the fact that their opinion is by the greater part of their readers, considered superior to that of any single author?

You admit, remember, that they are often unjust. Is it then a fair contest between them and any single author whom they chuse to abuse?

It is of no consequence what they may pretend to: it is certain that they are well aware of the advantage an ill-founded notion has given them, and as certain that they do not fail to make use of it; and that too "with a vengeance," as you term it. Sir, I would not support the worst authors even against a reviewer, though I would support one author against an equal force: it is not on the difference of talents that the inequality between them turns; but on the difference of weight from supposed numbers. It is not amiss sometimes you see to apply a little of my logic to your sophistry: it may be useful to you at times, but I promise you it will be always thrown away against

YACOOB TONSON.

To Homespun.

I can sympathize with you, brother HOMESPUN, very sincerely, for I have been many years a fellow-sufferer. You are a man after my own heart, and we are all much obliged to you for thus breaking the ice of this most necessary subject of animadversion. Really, there cannot be a greater evil than that which you notice; the being compelled to keep company, one has no relish for. I struggled long under these visitations, my good friend, and though it is said, that use makes all things easy, I would even now give my best coat (and let me tell you its not a bad one) to be able entirely to avoid them. The most effectual remedy I ever hit upon, was to turn the conversation immediately to that point, which my enemy knew least of; or better still, to that which I knew he disliked most. I held forth most desperately and unceasingly upon one of these, and, as was natural to expect, I very soon found the number of my dear friends on the decrease. I applauded myself greatly on this discovery, which I think much better than the downright rudeness of the fashionable cut. That seldom fails to leave a resolution towards re-payment, which, I confess, I am always unwilling to discover on the credit side of my books: no man, however, can be affronted by my tastes or pursuits; as little can he take offence at my expatiating upon them. The scheme to be sure will not entirely exclude every one; strangers of course will still attack your retirement, but it may be worth while to cultivate them; at least till you have them "on the hip," as Iago calls it. True, you may be thought a little odd and eccentric, but you will agree with me that one's peace and comfort is very cheaply purchased at such a trifling expence.

But, brother HOMESPUN, is it not hard that quiet men like us should be obliged to have recourse to such expedients? you, like myself, perhaps, wish to be on terms of decency with every man: you do not object to some degree of intimacy; but you very naturally do not desire so much as would interfere with your employments or amusements: yet no sooner shall a man arrive at a station than he thinks it necessary to commence a course of reciprocal visiting, or, in other words, compels one to be acquainted with him! What necessity can there be for visiting at all where neither friendship, high rank, or business requires it? business the common run of visitors have not—high rank, we perhaps have not—friendship, they certainly have not—what the plague then can they want? Is it a barter of formalities? a visit from chieftain to chieftain? are we all Rob Roys and Fergus McIvors?

One would think so, from the punctuality and exactness with which many of these ceremonialists weigh out their visitations: their motto is not exactly the polite parson Trulliber's "I caald vurst" but "I call'd last;" but these people are comparatively easy to deal with, for they never call a second time if the first be not returned; they become mortally offended; yet it is certainly very vexatious to be forced either to sacrifice our own time and pleasure, or to give umbrage to men, with whom on the real nature of things we have nothing to do.

But it is not to us alone, brother HOMESPUN, that this practice is a source of vexation: where do we go that we do not hear of the "bore of visiting?" every one complains of it, yet no one dares break thro' the established rule, lest he should lose his repute as a "good fellow:" Let our letters then be the first call to the abolition of it, and let those whose consequence gives weight to their practice, aid and assist us; which they will, I think, if they turn their attention for a moment to its bad effects.

In the first place, this whole crop of sour pouting and fretting, and its second crop of enmity and malice for unreturned or unpaid visits, will be radically crushed: for no man can take offence at that which will be no longer a slight. Secondly, Society would benefit by it, by the natural tendency it would have to improve and brighten conversation; for when men have no means of gossiping away their time, they will look to the enjoyments of reading and reflection; which cannot fail to improve their imagination, or at least to increase their information. We should not so frequently meet that vivacious animal, the Qui-hye, so often found in all ranks of the Service: an animal which though not exactly of the character of the Blatant beast (for which indeed he has not energy) yet tells dull stories of every man and every man's affairs for ever and ever: if it be necessary to point him out you know him at once by his text book, the Army List, his languid motions, and the eternal monotony of his hookah. What would not the fashionable world gain by such a change? how easily might they then preserve that distance and distinction, to which their various merits entitle them? There would be then no necessity (when they meet a vacant, a vapid, a clinger, or a yahoo) for the absent stare, the almost imperceptible shrug of the shoulders, the grinning chuck forward of the chin, and chuck backward of other parts: indeed, for neither chucking or ducking; all they have to do is to chuck the custom to the d—l. To those of the "new light," as it is termed, I need not point out its advantages: it will cleanse their way through this sink of corruption, and they will be as free in this world, from the contamination of deists, atheists, and infidels, in short, from all those who differ in opinion from them, as they hope to be far from them in the next—Men of business will (Irishmen-like) gain by the loss; and philosophers like you and I, brother HOMESPUN, will be left at liberty to promote the civilization of India, and to castigate our fellow-creatures in peace and quietness.

The word "Civilization," occurred instinctively some how or other in the above: I suppose from feeling that I am dwelling on a remnant of barbarism; for this practice unquestionably commenced in those times when the first toast was "a bloody war and a sickly season;" when every man was a Nuwaub, and every white woman a divinity! Society was then in its infancy: all Europeans associated of necessity wherever they met, and it might at that time have been justly deemed a dereliction from the love of our countrymen, had one Englishman shunned the acquaintance and visit of another: but not so now: Society is so much enlarged, that so far from there being any necessity for it, the practice has become a downright tax upon time, and in other respects a very serious annoyance.

I am, Brother Homespun, your good friend,

YACOOB TONSON.

HIGH WATER AT CALCUTTA THIS DAY.

	H.	M.
Morning,	6	32
Evening,	3	56

Pulsation.*To the Editor of the Journal.*

SIR,

I request permission to recommend through the medium of your Paper, a very simple device, worthy the adoption of persons curious in observing the precise times occupied by certain natural phenomena, as in Earthquakes, luminous or meteoric appearances, &c. or in matters of less general, though often intense, interest, as races against time, &c. Any person acquainted, with the usual rate of his pulse, has a ready Chronometer at hand on such occasions: in the dark, or when one's watch is mislaid, recourse may be had to this expedient with advantage and satisfaction. It is obviously advisable to correct or verify the apparent result, by means of a time keeper, as soon as one may be procurable after the event thus observed: this will obviate any miscalculation, arising by the rate being affected by alarm, anxiety, &c. or in case of actual indisposition. I need not scarcely observe that a pulsation, in most constitutions, affords a minuter division of time than a second or 1-60th of a minute.

I am, Sir, Your's, &c.

ETCÆTERA.

Court of Requests.*To the Editor of the Journal.*

SIR,

I should have imagined that enough had already been said as to Mr. Commissioner Brietzcke's decision on the Medical Gentleman's case to convince every unbiassed person of the extreme hardship of the decree, yet as you have given insertion, in your paper of this morning, to a Letter signed "WILLIAM" on the subject, perhaps the following observations upon its merits will not be deemed unworthy of a place in the JOURNAL.

The Court of Requests will no doubt feel extremely grateful to your Correspondent for the "word" he has said in their behalf, but I doubt whether the public will readily come into his opinion, although it coincides with the decision lately pronounced in that Court in the case he refers to.

Your Correspondent admits that the Defendant has been held liable to the Jurisdiction, for repairs done to vessels belonging to this port, of which he is the owner, yet denies that he ought to be recognized in this case as amenable, inasmuch as the Plaintiff "worked for his money at the 24 Pergunnahs and had therefore no right to complain here."

In reply to this "sapient" doctrine of WILLIAM, I would refer your Correspondent to the Proclamation of 1802, under which the present "Court of Commissioners for the Recovery of Small Debts" was created, which states "that it shall and may be lawful to and for every person or persons who shall have any debt or debts, owing unto him, her or them, by any person or persons whatsoever inhabiting or seeking a livelihood within the said Town of Calcutta and Settlement of Fort William, to be summoned to appear, &c." and then ask him whether under this distinct official exposition of the Jurisdiction of the Court the Defendant's plea of his non-liability ought to have been recorded, and I would further ask you or any of your readers whether this rule can be in any way twisted into a construction that the debt must have been contracted in Calcutta to make the debtor liable to the process of the Court, unless the impression which such a decision is calculated to produce is done away with it, might be the mean of doing incalculable injury to Traders and up-country Merchants who have this case before their eyes, would be deterred from instructing their Agents in Calcutta to recover from persons resident there, debts contracted in the upper provinces, under the erroneous idea that the goods having been furnished in a district where a Company's Judge exercises Jurisdiction he had no other course than to wait until his debtor again returned into that province, and which, by the bye, if this was "law," would seldom or never happen.

Your's obediently,

E.

Improvements in Revenue.

SIR,

To the Editor of the Journal.

I remarked in your excellent Journal the extract from the London COURIER, relating to the improvement in the Opium Revenue. I have also perused one or two Letters published by you on this subject, and particularly one signed "MORPHINE," who desires you to point out the several Functionaries to whom the improvements in the Public Revenue are to be ascribed; as I happen to know something of the matter, Mr. Editor, I can tell you that there are not several, but only one Public Functionary justly entitled to praise, and do not you, Sir, believe me the less, when I inform you that he is a Secretary to Government. To him indeed may be attributed not only the improvement in Opium, but also the Salt Customs, and Land Revenue.

Over the Hills and far away.

SOMNUS.

Bombay Marine.

SIR,

To the Editor of the Journal.

Can any of your Correspondents inform me how it happens that the Officers of the Bombay Marine have not been included in the honors of the "Order of the Bath?"

The Officers of this gallant Corps have distinguished themselves on several occasions; I may particularly mention the recent expedition under the command of Sir Wm. Kier, in the Red Sea, and also the capture of the Island of Ternate, &c. &c. in the year——, on which latter occasion the present gallant Chief of this respectable Corps acted a conspicuous part and was severely wounded.

The Officers of the Army and Navy of His Majesty's Service equally participate in these high honors, and I should be glad to see the invidious distinction removed in the Company's Service.

A FRIEND TO THE BRAVE.

Court of Requests.

SIR,

To the Editor of the Journal.

Having a natural aversion to every kind of imposition, I am occasionally summoned to the Court of Requests, by those whose impositions I have time and inclination to resist, and from this cause, I happened to be at that Court the other day, when it was occupied all the morning by a suit of the Marine Registry Office, and must confess I felt much surprise at the assurance with which the Counsel for that Office requested the Two Commissioners on the Bench not to decide the cause without a Quorum.

As the description which Mr. QUORUM gives of himself, to wit, that "he is a quiet man, and therefore not subjected to be called to the Court on his own account," so ill accords with his acts and deeds, I have strong suspicions of his being a wolf in sheep's clothing. He says "The declaration of the Commissioner that HE was a Quorum" greatly excited his admiration, tho' "above his comprehension;" and when he found the cause he came about was postponed, "he hurried home to his house in totality, and as hastily when he got there, consulted his Law Dictionary, his Johnson's Dictionary, and his Friend," and lastly he takes the trouble to make a public exhibition of his Friend's invidious comparison, no doubt out of pure kindness for the Commissioners of the Court of Requests, he "being a quiet man and having no occasion with them or their Court on his own account."

According to his own extract from Johnson's Dictionary (for I have no Johnson's Dictionary of my own), Mr. QUORUM boldly asserts that Johnson "must" be wrong, for he defines a Quorum to be "A Bench of Justices." Such a number "of any Officers as IS sufficient to decide:" that is,—the number sufficient to decide IS a Quorum: thence arises the main question,—Is the "number" ONE of the Commissioners of the Court of Requests sufficient to decide? And this question is answered in the affirmative by the common daily custom of the Court itself, where it is the custom and daily practice for one Commissioner and only one to sit in the same room, or on the same Bench, and then and there to decide innumerable causes. So much for QUORUM from.

QUORUMABUS.

ASIATIC DEPARTMENT.

— 93 —

Disputed Meaning.

Sir,

To the Editor of the Journal.

I beg to call your attention to the following quotation from *بافر قزوینی* or *عربی* which proves to my satisfaction, as it has to that of great Native scholars, (to one of whom I owe the hint) that "Tursa" did not originally mean "CHRISTIAN," although it may have been ignorantly so applied in later ages. I see nothing to the point, in the two quotations of the learned and amiable Native Editor, whom, however, I, for one, freely acquit of all intended disrespect.

در طوف حرم بودم ترسا بچه من گفتم

بخاین خاند باین خوبن ا تشکده بایستی

"Whilst I was engaged in going round the Temple of Mecca, a Tursa's child said,—This house with such beauty is fit for a Fire Worshipper's Temple."

Your's, Sir,

A. —

Religious Enquiry.

Sir,

To the Editor of the Journal.

When I consider the weakness of human nature, and that we are too frequently irregularly led away by our passions instead of being directed by reason. I am not at all surprised at the application of such epithets to Unitarianism, as "Antichristian," "Blasphemous," and "Satanical," by Dr. TYTLER, in his letter published in the INDIA GAZETTE, of the 29th ultimo. That charity to which we are all enjoined as professors of Christianity, necessarily disposes me not to retaliate such conduct by branding Trinitarianism, which he professes; with the same epithets; altho', as in his case, nothing else seems necessary to this, but a surrender of our reason and temper to the baser passions of human nature. He must, however be informed, that Unitarianism is not, as he has stigmatized it "Antichristian," because in perfect conformity to Christ's example it professes the worship of one Supreme Deity alone. It is not "Blasphemous," because it excludes the exaltation of any thing inferior to Deity, to the throne of the Most High. It cannot be "Satanical," because it rejects every doctrine not contained in the Bible. How far Trinitarianism, for which he seems so zealous, is distinguished by these characteristics. I leave him to explain and defend; and thereby also to prove that his zeal is according to knowledge.

He expresses his surprise that the passages of Scripture in St. John's Gospel, c. 1. v. 1. to 14. were not brought forward in my letter of the 10th ultimo, when a little attention to it might have convinced him, that they could not possibly be adduced, as it was the object of that letter only to give an account of some religious conferences held by a Society, meeting for this purpose, on which account, no passage that was not brought forward at the Meeting could be included; but as he supposes these passages prove his doctrine, I do not hesitate to give them due consideration.

"In the beginning was the Word."—This passage is understood as referring to the period before the formation of the world, and that Jesus then existed. Why it should have this meaning I cannot discover. Permitting St. John to explain himself, and considering that he uses this word "beginning" eleven times as signifying the beginning of the Gospel dispensation, and six of these times in this view with respect to Jesus himself, it seems more natural to conclude that he means to convey the same idea here:

"The Word was with God."—Jesus, at the beginning of the Gospel dispensation, was with God in private meditation and prayer: a life of devotion being expressed in Scripture by being with and walking with God. Gen. 5, 26. "And Enoch walked with God." Exod. 34, 28. "And he Moses was there with the Lord."

"The Word was God."—Allowing Jesus and his Apostles to give the meaning of Scripture, it will appear evident, that the term "God" is here used in a subordinate sense; for not only

does Jesus allow that human beings are called Gods, (John 10. 35) and Paul says (1st Cor. 8. 5.) "There be Gods many;" but they also give us such ideas of the nature of the Deity as sufficiently enables us to distinguish him from all other beings. They maintain his immateriality (Jesus says, John 4. 24. "God is a Spirit"); his invisible nature. (St. Paul and St. John say 1st Tim. 6. 16. John 1. 18. and Gen. Epist. 4. 12. "God no man hath seen or can see"); his immortality (1st Tim. 6. 16. "God alone hath immortality.") Now since Jesus tells us he is not a Spirit (Luke 24. 39. "a Spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have); and St. Paul and St. John declare (1st Cor. 9. 1 and Gen. Epist. of John 1. 1.) that they saw Jesus and (1st Cor. 15. 3. and John 19. 30) that he died; it certainly could not have been the doctrine of Jesus or his Apostles that Jesus is the Supreme God. The term "God," therefore, when applied to him, must be used in an inferior sense; this conclusion is further confirmed by the incontrovertible and convincing fact that Jesus, even after his exaltation at God's right hand, acknowledges a Superior, which is also declared by his Apostles. In Rev. 3. 12. Jesus says, "Him that overcometh, I will make a pillar in the temple of my God, and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which cometh down of heaven from my God;" and the Apostles in their writings have this expression seven times, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," and forty-two times mention the Father alone as God.

"All things were made by him."—This is generally understood of the creation of every thing by Jesus; but that this is not the Apostle's meaning appears from his own writings. As the words "all things," are never used by him for the works of creation, why should they have this sense here? and as the original word here rendered "were made," is used more than a hundred times by him, but never as implying creation, why should this be its meaning here? the more so, as this rendering, "all things (that is, relative to the Gospel Dispensation) were done through him," does not seem liable to any objection.

"He (the Light Jesus) was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not."—From this text it is generally inferred that Jesus made the world, a conclusion which appears from the following facts not to be well-founded—First: The word "World" is used by St. John seventy six times in his writings; but seldom, if ever, in the sense of the sublunary creation or material world, and even the word in the text before us cannot have this meaning, but (as in all other places) signifies the rational creation (human beings); "for it is added the World knew him not," which cannot be said of the material World.—Secondly: The original word here translated, "was made" (as has been already observed) is never used by this writer in the sense of creation.—Thirdly: This Apostle invariably, when alluding to the material World, enumerates its constituent parts, and in all such cases ascribes the creation to God. Rev. 10. 6 "God created Heaven and the things therein, the Earth and the things therein, and the Sea and the things therein;" and Rev. 14. 7 God made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea and the Fountains of waters. Fourthly, no objection exists (as far as I know) to the following rendering of the passage, "He (the Light Jesus) was in the World, and the World was (enlightened) by him, and the World knew him not."

"The Word was made Flesh."—What can be more convincing than this passage, that the blessed Jesus was a man, I cannot conceive; for it most expressly and unequivocally asserts that he was made flesh, viz. a human being; and when it is considered that the proper rendering of the original should be "the word was flesh," that is, was a man or human being, this conviction is irresistible, and only further confirmed by the fact that even after his exaltation, Jesus is by his Apostles in their writings, eight times declared "a man;" and it is not absolutely certain that (according even to some Trinitarian Expositors) the term God is even in a subordinate sense ever applied to him in the New Testament; with the exception perhaps of the passage we have just been considering.

I am, Sir, Your's obediently,

September 5, 1822.

AN UNITARIAN.

Defence of Unitarianism,

To the Editor of the India Gazette.

SIR,

I have lately seen in your paper a tirade by Dr. Tytler, against the Unitarians. This man makes himself ridiculous on whatever subject he writes, whether it be medicine or theology. I pass by at present his self-contradictions, his oracular interpretations of prophecy, his absurd etymologies, his apparently profound and intimate acquaintance with the secret operations of Satan, and above all his denial that the Father is the creator of the world—in which last he offends as much against the letter of the Trinitarian as against the spirit of the Unitarian doctrine—and notice only his foul abuse of Unitarians and Unitarianism. To engage in a newspaper controversy with a man renowned over the whole of India for the *cacoethes scribendi* is certainly very far from my intention. To attempt to argue with him, inflamed as he is by the most violent prejudices, would be a sad prostitution of the reasoning powers. To convince such a redoubtable champion of Ultra-Athanasian orthodoxy, of the slanders he has uttered, is more than I can expect. But to expose his misrepresentations and to vindicate the character of a body of men who are the best friends of Christianity, because they are its most consistent believers, may not be altogether useless.

He seems to have exhausted his well-furnished quiver of the poisoned arrows it contained to discharge them with relentless ire and winged speed at the devoted Unitarians. No abuse is too foul, no comparison too debasing for his purpose. Unitarianism is "blasphemy" and "Satanism." It is "an open denial of the Father and the Son." It is "the Antichristian enemy of man." It is "far more reprehensible than Popery." Its doctrines are "more pernicious because more insidious, and therefore more purely Satanic," than "the open blasphemy of Carile." And to a crown all, the attempts of Unitarians "are diabolical," and have in view "to degrade the inconceivable majesty of omnipotence." Poor man! as if either his mistakes or mine could lessen or increase the majesty of the Supreme! And yet it is the man who uses this language, and who indulges in this scurrility, that has the daring effrontery to stand forth as the friend and advocate of the meek and lowly Jesus—of Him who during his humane life, was himself frequently charged with "Satanism," and was at last put to death under an alleged conviction for "blasphemy;" but who amidst all the contumely to which he was exposed, and all the sufferings which he endured, committed himself to him that judgeth righteously, and even in his expiring agonies breathed forth a prayer for his murderous enemies! O Sir! what a contrast between the disciple and the master! Is it too much to suppose that, if Jesus were now in earth, he would frown such fiery zealots into silence with the reproof which he formerly administered to two of his disciples, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of?"

The commencement of John's Gospel which Dr. Tytler has adduced as a proof, that Jesus is God, has been more widely misapplied from its original meaning than perhaps any other portion of the writings of the New Testament—to be convinced of which a candid examination of the terms employed by the Apostle is all that is necessary. The writer in the JOURNAL, however, upon whom Dr. T. more directly adverts, is, I believe, both able and willing to answer for himself. He will, I have no doubt, point out the inconsistencies which the Trinitarian interpretation of that passage involves, and show the extremely plain and simple explanation of which, on the Unitarian hypothesis, it is susceptible. He has no arguments to answer, for Dr. T. has not deigned to employ any. Instead of proof he gives assertion—instead of a dispassionate investigation into the force of the original terms, and the design of the whole context, he protrudes in staring capitals certain insulated expressions on which he grounds his faith,—and instead of the deductions of a sound and rational criticism applied to this much controverted passage, by indulging in intemperate railings, he gives the most satisfactory evidence to all sober-minded men, that he neither knows what he says, nor whereof he affirms.

Dr. Tytler considers Unitarianism a medium between Popery and Infidelity. If by this he means to intimate that it partakes of the principles of either or of both, he only gives another proof that he is wholly ignorant of a subject, which he has gratuitously undertaken to discuss. Unitarians profess to find nothing in the Gospel but what is entirely consistent with the plainest dictates of reason—nothing but what is supported by a variety and strength of evidence irresistibly convincing. By the former they place themselves in irreconcilable hostility with Popery; and by the latter at the furthest possible remove from Infidelity. In one sense, therefore, Unitarianism is a medium between Popery and Infidelity, inasmuch as a rational belief in Christianity lies at an equal distance from the blind superstition of the one, and the rash incredulity of the other.

Calcutta; September 4, 1822.

W. ADAM.

Selections.

Military Intelligence.—The following is an Extract from a Letter dated Benares, 26th August, 1822.

"The Artillery Relief has just reached this Station in progress to Cawnpore by water. Captain Curphey, who has commanded the Artillery at this Station for the last two years, having been removed to one of the Companies composing the relief, has joined, and as Senior Officer assumed the Command of the Relief Detachment."

Military Intelligence.—A letter from our Correspondent at Cawnpore, dated the 26th ultimo, states that his Majesty's 59th Regiment, under the Command of Lieutenant Colonel McGregor, proceeding by Water from Dinapore to Cawnpore, were on the morning of that day, within six coas of the latter Station, and all safe. The young Officers who proceeded from the Presidency, in the latter end of July, under charge of Lieutenant Gray of the 2nd Battalion 9th Regiment Native Infantry, reached Dinapore, in safety, on the 21st ultimo.

Epidemic.—Fresh accounts still reach us of the devastations of the Epidemic, which we yesterday announced as prevalent in Calcutta and its vicinity. The Reverend HENRY LLOYD LOMAX, D. D. Archdeacon of Calcutta, fell a victim to this fatal distemper in the evening of Wednesday; being the third member of the Episcopal Establishment at this Presidency who has died within the last two months. A little before he was seized, he wrote to a friend with whom he had promised to dine, excusing himself on account of a slight feeling of indisposition. He was taken ill about 2 o'clock in the afternoon; about 5 no hopes of recovery remained, and about 16 he was a corpse. So rapid is the progress of this dreadful disease.

We have not been able to ascertain with any degree of accuracy to what extent the Cholera prevails; but to prepare for the worst we think it our duty to advise the Public to arm themselves against its attacks. A gentleman having accidentally mentioned to us yesterday that he had in his possession a New Remedy that had been devised, we immediately made enquiries of him about it, and obtained from him the following account of it as given in a hand-bill written in French and English, which, as probably few of our readers might have an opportunity of seeing it, we here subjoin:—

"Plague Preventive and Anti-Cholera.—This inestimable medicine, was used by the Great Volney in his travels through Greece, Egypt, Persia and India, as a preservative against the Epidemic disorders, with which those countries are so frequently visited. On Volney's return to Paris this medicine was used only in cases of Cholera and Palpitation of the Heart: in both a single dose gave immediate relief: its efficacy induced a trail of its powers on the desolating Epidemic that lately raged in Barcelona with every symptom of Cholera, to which it put a complete stop.

"Sold by Monsr. Selanger, sole proprietor of the medicine at Lisle: It is now offered to the inhabitants of Bengal by Messrs. Grigg, Pengelly & Co. to try its powers on the first symptoms of Cholera, as a preventive against Epidemic disorders, and a certain remedy for Cholera and Palpitation of the Heart.

"A bottle containing four doses Six Rupees.

Two table spoonfuls of the mixture is sufficient in cases of Cholera and Palpitation, three table spoonfuls was the quantity given in the Barcelona Epidemic. As a preventive against contagion, a single drop on the tongue from a smelling bottle of the same mixture will be a sufficient preservative for eight hours."

"The above we understand has within these few days been administered in some cases of Cholera here, with complete success.

Another Launch.—A Launch is to take place from the Newly-established Building yard of Mr. Peter Foster on Saturday the 7th instant at half past two o'clock in the afternoon. —*Hurkaru.*

Births.

On the 2d instant, Mrs. THOMAS B. SCOTT, of a Daughter.

At Muttra, on the 22nd ultimo, the Lady of Captain ROBERT ARDING THOMAS, 1st Battalion 24th Regiment, of a Son.

At Bolarum, near Hyderabad, on the 19th ultimo, the Lady of Captain WADDELL, Paymaster, Hyderabad Subsidiary Force, of a Daughter.

Deaths.

On Friday, the 30th ultimo, after a short but severe illness, on board the Ship, at the New Anchorage, Mr. JOHN AUSTIN, Surgeon of the H. C. Ship DUTCHESS OF ATHOLL. He was followed to the grave by Captain DANIELL, and the Officers of the DUTCHESS OF ATHOLL, with every mark of respect for a Man whose private virtues will endear his memory to all who had the happiness to share his friendship, and who now deeply lament his loss.

Native Papers.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE SUNGRAD COWMOODY.

Death.—One Ram Dhon Sircar living at Symlya, had a shop in the China Bazar where he went every day to deal in almonds, raisins, and such other delicious things. On Tuesday, the 26th of Aushaur this man was, however, unfortunately stung on the thigh by a wasp, the moment of his stepping into the shop. The smart obliged him immediately to leave the shop and repair to his house, where he fell asleep, as it were quite inanimate; and having remained in the same state that day, expired on the next. After the funeral pile was prepared, his chaste consort shared it with her husband.

A Rogue.—About nine in the Morning of Thursday, the 14th of Aushaur a certain person came into the shop of a dealer in wood in the Moyda Putty of Burrabazar in Calcutta, belonging to Korcen Mollik, a Moosulman, and offered himself a purchaser of wood. The price having therefore been settled at four Maunds per Rupee, he got weighed for him a quantity of wood for four Annas, and told the dealer, he had neither any Sikies (quarters of Rupees) nor Pice with him, but two whole rupees, and as he required a great number of Pice, he desired him to take the two Rupees and give him as many Pice as there were in seven Sikies. With this he put into the hands of the dealer two rupees newly coined, who after the inspection of the money by a banker, gave him a load of for four Annas, and paid him the remainder in Pice.

Mulik being then told that he was expected to pay the coolie hire, got vexed, and returned him the two rupees taking back from him the Pice and wood. The purchaser, however, immediately after agreeing to pay the coolie hire, gave the shop keeper the former ones, and received from him the same number of Pice as before. He then got a load of wood weighed and bonded ready for him and excusing himself to Mulik that on his return from the Bazar, where he was going to buy some beetle-nuts, he would take away the wood, departed thence to return no more. The shop keeper expected him till the evening when doubting his veracity, upon inspection the coins turned out to be of copper. Altho' the latter has made some gain, it was to the great dissatisfaction of the former.

A Husband betrayed by his Wife.—In consequence of Roffy Mahmood, a Moosulman of Etaly in the suburbs of Calcutta, having some how quarrelled with his wife on the night of Tuesday the 2nd of July, and beat her, she went, full of revenge, to the Thana and declared that her husband conjointly with Maudhub, the Chowkeydar of the place, committed burglary every night, and that they shared between them all the stolen articles. At these words the Thanadar went to seize the persons accused and his first attempted was the apprehension of Roffy Mahmood, who being always on his guard, contrived to effect his escape from the house. The Thanadar next came and seized Maudhub Chowkeydar, bound him fast, and brought him to the Thana at Maunik Tolloh to be kept in confinement.

Many exertions are now making to secure Roffy Mahmood, but without success. His wife has produced all his professional implements to the Thanadar.

Poorsootetum.—We understand that among the body of pilgrims for Poorsootetum this year there was a number of wealthy, pious, and well meaning descendants of respectable persons, residing in Calcutta; who, attended by their respective concubines, went to the sanctuary, all the way coquetting, and amusing themselves with songs, musical instruments, dance and a variety of other pleasures. Thus with the greatest respect for the sanctuary, these pious souls got into it, and the first thing they did was to make oaths; the concubine to her gallant and vice versa, with their hands, upon the temple of Juggernaut, to remain inseparable the whole of their lives. In the mean time being perceived by the Pandas (priests) they were flogged with a rattan from the toe to the head, which was certainly a just recompense for their oaths.

The virtuous Baboojies are now returned home, having succeeded to bring about an eternal salvation.

Mirzapoor.—By a letter from the Zillah of Mirzapoor we learn, that the cash-keeper to the judge of that district after the closing of the Court on the evening of Saturday the 18th May, having examined the cash of which he had the charge, locked it in a wooden chest as usual and left it in the charge of the Sepoy who watched over it, the following day being Sunday and Monday a festival, the Cutchery was not opened till Tuesday the 21st of May about ten in the morning; the cashier being present found to his great consternation one of the three locks of the chest broken. He immediately went and informed the judge of the circumstance who came in person and ordered him to open the chest and examine the money; which he accordingly did, and perceived a hole at the bottom of the chest capable of admitting a man's hand. This surprised everybody, and the cash came to fall short of Sa. Rs. 5966, 13., 4. upon this the judge arrested all the Sepoys under whose charge the treasure chest

had been placed and transmitted them to the commanding officer of the district. The cashier also is making enquiries amongst the whole Aumlah, but he has not yet been able to obtain any information.

Pensions Granted.—We beg to announce to the Public that upon a petition having been submitted to the merciful Government for the grant of a pension to maintain the families of the workmen killed by the late fire at the H. C.'s Powder Mills at Ichapoor, Government generously adopt the following mode for their support, on the 28th June. There being only eight workmen among the number of lives lost by the fire at the Powder Mills; the mother of one, and the wives of five of them are to receive a monthly pensions of three rupees each during their lives; and two sons of the other two workmen, are to have two rupees each until they will be enabled to gain their subsistence.

Benares.—A Mahratta Brahmin, an inhabitant of Benares, had a maid-servant, who on the 15th of June having stolen out of his house jewels to the value of about six thousand rupees entrusted them to the care of a Brahmin in the neighbourhood, of the name of Onunto Ram Sorma. The Mahratta Brahmin made many enquiries about the jewels, but to no purpose. Some time after the maid-servant asked Onunto Ram Sorma for the stolen jewels, but being refused them she went to the Thanah with tears in her eyes and thus complained to the Daroga; "As a deposit I had entrusted Onunto Ram Sorma with some of my jewels, but he will not return them now." The Daroga without delay dispatched a Burkundaz to bring Onunto Ram Sorma to the Thana who being asked as to the truth of the accusation did not confess his guilt; upon which the Daroga gave him a severe flogging, but even that could not draw a confession from him. The former method not succeeding, the Daroga sent a person secretly to Onunto Ram's house, when he declared himself to be a messenger on the part of Onunto Ram Sorma who he said had been almost flogged to death by the Daroga, and would certainly die if the flogging was repeated; that he was sent to take some jewels and pledge them for a sum to be given in bribe to the Daroga in order to buy this Sorma's freedom. The domestics mistaking him to be in earnest, made all possible haste to bring a part of the stolen jewels to the Thana, which the complainant perceiving cried out those were hers. Onunto Ram was now thrown into great confusion, and could not make any answer. The Daroga after many inquiries came to know that those jewels were not the property of the maid-servant either, but belonged to the above mentioned Mahratta Brahmin, who was accordingly sent for; and on his representations the Daroga transmitted Onunto Ram Sorma, the maid-servant, and some of the friends of the former, to the Judge.—*Summachar Durpun.*

Jungypoor.—A letter from Jungypoor informs us, that on the other side the Ganges, which lies to the west of it, there lives in the village of Baly Ghanta, a true Kaesto, named Taloo Ram Baboo, one of his domestics had got from the market on the 6th of Aushaur a Kantal (bread-fruit) which was partaken of by twenty-five persons from the oldest to the youngest in the house. Twenty-two of them were seized with the Cholera Morbus, and the other three grew senseless. In this state they all remained for two days and on the third about three P. M. ten persons among them recovered; on the fourth, by the aid of incantations, nine more were restored to health, and three others met with the same recovery on the fifth day; so that it has pleased God to save all of them by this time. The only thing we are surprised at, is how the Kantal (bread-fruit) could operate like poison upon those persons, since it is never poisoned by the snake?

Commillah.—We learn by a letter from the Zillah of Commillah that it is long since Makeem, a Moosulman of the Zillah of Farriadpore, came to Calcutta in the hope of getting some employment. He was soon after, however, employed a Durrowan at the house of an English Gentleman and had continued in that situation for some time when his younger brother came to live with him.—One night while the two brothers conversed together keeping the door, a certain person brought them a paper written in Persian and desired them to read it, but they said they knew not how to read. Upon this the man reproached them saying that they possessed merely an outward beauty without any mental accomplishment. These reproaches stung them to the quick, and they left the place for some distant country, when without attending to any other pursuits they closely applied themselves to their studies, and the two brothers were at last crowned with a stock of learning. The younger one returned to me, but the elder became a dervish, and has lately erected a mosque in one corner of the Punocho Patra, in the Zillah of Commillah. He seems to possess such supernatural powers as to have healed and still to heal the Zamin-dars and many other rich inhabitants of that place any diseases whatever, the instant of their going to him. So Makeem, who is now called Fokeer-kabale Shaw Shahab, has become as it were a prophet, and renowned for his supernatural powers and great wisdom. The Money he acquires, is spent in hospitality and charity to the poor, without any part of it being sent home; and for these acts of benevolence, he is much more esteemed by the people than any of his contemporaries.

Postscript.

Madras Gazette Office, Wednesday Evening, August 21, 1822.
—We hasten to announce the arrival in the Roads of the Ships CLYDE, Captain Driver, and MOIRA, Captain Hornblow, both from London, the former left on the 31st March, the latter on the 1st of May.

Passengers per Ship Clyde.—Mrs. J. O'Brien; Captain P. L. Price; Lieutenant S. Walker; Lieutenant O'Brien; Mr. B. Bell; Mr. E. Armitage; Mr. James Burnett; Mr. R. Smith; Mr. F. Daniel; Mr. W. Glen; Mr. James Briggs; Mr. W. Taynton; Mr. James Forbes; Mr. P. Wilkie; Mr. A. Campbell; and Mr. E. Jessop.

Passengers per Ship Moira, Captain Hornblow.—FOR MADRAS.—Mrs. Rundall; Mrs. Ardagh; Mrs. Hunter; Mrs. Leighton; Mrs. Lister; Miss Leighton; Miss Jane Leighton; Miss Cathcart; Colonel Nutball; Captain Ardagh; Mr. Lister, Assistant Surgeon; Mr. Hunter, and Mr. J. Summers, Free Merchants; Captain Garrick, Free Mariner; Messrs. Robert Cox, Geo. Davison, F. L. Nicolay, Henry Neale, Henry Smith, and G. Neale, Cadets; Eliza Brannick, Servant to Mrs. Hunter, Mrs. Leslie, Servant to Mrs. Leighton, Flora, Servant to Mrs. Penrose, Frederick; Servant to Captain Ardagh.—FOR BENGAL.—Mrs. Chesney; Mrs. Penrose; Miss Twentymann; Lieutenant Chesney; Lieutenant Penrose; Mr. Twentymann, Merchant; Mr. Burt; Mr. Richardson; Messieurs John T. Boileau; John Chesney; and Samuel Stapleton, Cadets; Gotlieb, Servant to Mrs. Rundall.

The COMPATITOR, Low, from Madras arrived at Deal on the 21st April, and on the same day the H. C. Ship INGLIS arrived in Margate Roads from China 29th November.—The ROCHESTER reached Deal on the 26th April.

We are sorry not to perceive any diminution of disaffection in Ireland—and regret to say that several parts of Scotland also have manifested symptoms of insubordination.

The American Journals insinuate great displeasure at our tacit acknowledgement of the independence of South America.

The prices of provisions in general were considerably reduced—but great disturbances were still prevalent in the manufacturing districts, particularly Nottinghamshire.

Courier Office, 11 o'Clock.—We have the pleasure of announcing the arrival of two of our excepted ships—the CLYDE, Capt. Driver, from London the 31st of March, Madeira the 25th April, and Johannah 21st ultimo—and the MOIRA, Capt. W. Hornblow, from London the 1st of May, and Port Praya the 23d of that month.

Both these Vessels brought large Mails, and the letters are now in course of delivery.

The BENGAL MERCHANT bound for this Port sailed in the middle of April, and had passed St. Jago before the MOIRA arrived there.

Mr. Burdett, a brother of Sir Francis Brudett, had been arrested at Paris "on suspicion of having Treasonable Papers in his possession."

Mr. CANNING was not to embark for India until October.

The ROCHESTER and BOYNE from Bengal arrived in the Downs on the 26th April.

From the reports of the Markets we are glad to observe that East India Produce was looking up, and that the prices of all Colonial articles had improved.

The foreign News are full of interest, and for the fiftieth time we are told War must take place between Russia and Turkey. It is evident, however, that matters are drawing to a crisis. At present time will not admit of our adding to the above precis of intelligence.

The Ship MARY ANNE, Captain J. Webster, from Port Louis and Mauritius 31st July, has also come in since the above matter was prepared for the Press.

Lines to a Young Lady.

(From the India Gazette.)

Ye guardian spirits! throned on high,
Who rule this nether world of ours,—
Who urge the seasons down the sky,
And give and guide Life's fleeting hours;—
If Beauty grace your hallowed sphere—
If Virtue or if Love be dear—
Oh! cheer a son of grief oppress,
And grant a Lover's fond request!

For her whose grace of form and soul
This sorrowing breast of mine controul,—
Oh! scatter fortune's fairest flowers,
And aye select your sweetest hours,
From such as soothe a heart oppress,
And prove its trembling wishes blest,—
From such as bid the bosom glow,
And teach luxurious tears to flow,—
From such as shed a brightening beam
O'er Life's dark transitory dream,
And flush with joy, and transport true,
Young Beauty's cheek, and eye of blue,
Where graces smile, and pleasures play,
And tender Love, and fancy gay!

Ah yes!—if Rosa's day of life be blest
Enough for me—whom woes unnumbered swell—
With doubts distracted, and with cares oppress,
The Flatterer Hope hath bid my breast farewell!

The coldness that my heart hath riven,
That still prolongs my pain,—
Rosa—though cruel—'tis forgiven—
Though unforget in plaintive strain.
And still the Muse's Harp of sorrow,
Shall prove its saddest notes to thee,
Though not a sigh its tones may borrow,—
Though vain its mournful minstrelsy!

Loved Maid farewell!—but not with the farewell
The exterior graces, and the soul refined,
Their tender image cherished long and well,
Shall warm my heart, and cheer my pensive mind!

What though with withering Cypress shaded,
And dark my grief-worn brow—
Tho' woes oppress, and hopes are faded,—
And sighs shall breathe, and tears shall flow;—
When fancy paints thy bright blue eye
The dew of sympathy revealing,
'Twill sooth my bosom's agony,
And calm each ruder feeling!

D. L. R.

Shipping Arrivals.

MADRAS.

Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders	From Whence	Left
Aug. 14	Sophia	British		Trincomalee	—

Shipping Departures.

CALCUTTA.

Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders	Destination
Sept. 5	Horatio	British	J. M. Budwell	Trincomalee

MADRAS.

Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders	Destination
Aug. 13	Perseverance	British	J. H. Carter	Sumatra
14	H. M. Sch. Cochin	British	E. Tincombe	on a Cruise
15	Volunteer	British	T. Waterman	Calcutta

Stations of Vessels in the River.

CALCUTTA, SEPTEMBER 4, 1822.

Kedgerree.—RANGOON PACKET (brig), inward-bound, remains.

New Anchorage.—H. C. Ship ASIA, and St. THIAGO MAIOR, (P.)

Saugor.—H. C. S. DUCHESSE OF ATHOLL, CAROLINE (brig), and JAMES SCOTT, outward-bound, remain.

The HOMER (Amrcn.) arrived off Calcutta on Wednesday.